arXiv:1602.03087v5 [math.NT] 1 Jan 2017

DETERMINATION OF IRREDUCIBILITY OF A HOLOMORPHIC ETA QUOTIENT

SOUMYA BHATTACHARYA

Abstract. We address the fundamental problem of constructing an algorithm that determines whether or not a given holomorphic eta quotient f is a product of two holomorphic eta quotients other than 1 and itself. The difficulty of the problem stems from an apparent lack of information about the existence of an upper bound for the minimum of the levels of the proper factors of f. We show that any reducible holomorphic eta quotient of a prime power level N has a nontrivial factor whose level divides N. As a consequence, it follows that all rescalings by positive integers and all Atkin-Lehner involutions of irreducible holomorphic eta quotients of prime power levels are irreducible. For general N, we provide an explicit upper bound in terms of N for the minimum of the levels of the proper factors of a holomorphic eta quotient f of level N. This bound has a further refinement with respect to the weight of f. Moreover, we show that if a holomorphic eta quotient f of level N has no proper factors whose level divide N, then the levels of all the factors of f are bounded above with respect to N.

1. Introduction

The Dedekind eta function is defined by the infinite product:

$$\eta(z) := q^{\frac{1}{24}} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1-q^n) \text{ for all } z \in \mathfrak{H}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $q^r = q^r(z) := e^{2\pi irz}$ for all r and $\mathfrak{H} := \{\tau \in \mathbb{C} \,|\, \mathrm{Im}(\tau) > 0\}$. Eta is a holomorphic function on $\mathfrak{H}$ with no zeros. This function comes up naturally in many areas of Mathematics. For example, η has its significance in Elementary Number Theory, because $1/\eta$ is the generating function for the ordinary partition function $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ (see [1]) and because η leads to Dedekind sums (via its modular transformation property, see [20]). The eta function is also relevant in Algebraic Number Theory, viz. if $z_1, z_2 \in \mathfrak{H}$ belong to an imaginary quadratic field, then $\eta(z_1)/\eta(z_2)$ is algebraic (see [12]) and in Analytic Number Theory, e. g. the constant term in the Laurent expansion at 1 of the Epstein zeta function ζ_Q attached to a positive definite quadratic form Q is related via the Kronecker limit formula to the value of η at the root of the associated quadratic polynomial in $\mathfrak{H}$ (see [13]). The value of η at such a quadratic irrationality of discriminant $-D$ is also related via the Lerch/Chowla-Selberg formula to the values of the Gamma function with arguments in $D^{-1}\mathbb{N}$ (see [41]). Further, eta quotients appear in denominator formula for Kac-Moody algebras, (see [23]), in "Moonshine"

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11F20, 11F37, 11F11; Secondary 11Y05, 11Y16, 11G16, 11F12.

of finite groups (see [19]), in Probability Theory, e. g. in the distribution of the distance travelled in a uniform four-step random walk (see [10]) and in the distribution of crossing probability in two-dimensional percolation (see [25]), in Physics, viz. in counting microstates of supersymmetric black holes (see [15]) and in Knot Theory, e. g. in connection with Vassiliev invariants (see [42]) as well as in the topological equivalence of the Lorenz knot with the Modular knot (see [29]). In particular, holomorphic eta quotients provide us with a huge supply of explicit examples of modular forms. Now, it is more than a century past the time when Dedekind studied the modular transformation properties of η (see [16]). But even in the recent past, a lot of research has been done to unearth many interesting features of eta quotients (for example, see [3], [11], [14], [24], [28], [31] and [39]).

The function η is a modular form of weight $1/2$ with a multiplier system on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ (see [26]). An eta quotient f is a finite product of the form

$$\prod \eta_d^{X_d}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $d \in \mathbb{N}$, η_d is the *rescaling* of η by d, defined by

$$\eta_d(z) := \eta(dz) \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathfrak{H} \tag{1.3}$$

and the *exponents* $X_d \in \mathbb{Z}$. Eta quotients naturally inherit modularity from η: The eta quotient f in (1.2) transforms like a modular form of weight $\frac{1}{2}\sum_d X_d$ with a multiplier system on suitable congruence subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$: The largest among these subgroups is

$$\Gamma_0(N) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \;\middle|\; c \equiv 0 \pmod{N} \right\}, \tag{1.4}$$

where

$$N := \mathrm{lcm}\{d \in \mathbb{N} \,|\, X_d \neq 0\}. \tag{1.5}$$

We call N the *level* of f. Since η is non-zero on $\mathfrak{H}$, the eta quotient f is holomorphic if and only if f does not have any pole at the cusps of $\Gamma_0(N)$.

Let f and g be two holomorphic eta quotients. If the eta quotient f/g is holomorphic, we call g a *factor* of f. A holomorphic eta quotient f is *irreducible* if it has only the trivial factors, viz. 1 and f. By a descent argument on the weights of holomorphic eta quotients, it follows that each holomorphic eta quotient is a product of irreducible holomorphic eta quotients, though such a factorization may not be unique.

Irreducible holomorphic eta quotients were first considered by Zagier, who conjectured (see [43]) that:

(1.6) *There are only finitely many primitive and irreducible holomorphic eta quotients of a given weight.*

An eta quotient f is *primitive* if no eta quotient h and no integer $\nu > 1$ satisfy the equation $f = h_\nu$, where $h_\nu(z) := h(\nu z)$ for all $z \in \mathfrak{H}$. Zagier's conjecture was established by his student Mersmann in an excellent *Diplomarbeit* [32]. I gave a simplification of his proof in [6] and I showed in [5] that the following analog of Zagier's conjecture also holds:

(1.7) *There are only finitely many irreducible holomorphic eta quotients of a given level.*

Note that the notion of reducibility of a holomorphic eta quotient allows factors of arbitrary levels. For example, we have

$$\frac{\eta\eta_2\eta_6}{\eta_3} = \frac{\eta\eta_4\eta_6^2}{\eta_2\eta_3\eta_{12}} \times \frac{\eta_2^2\eta_{12}}{\eta_4\eta_6}, \tag{1.8}$$

where a reducible holomorphic eta quotient of level 6 is factored into two holomorphic eta quotients of level 12.

A trivial consequence of the valence formula (3.10) is that every nonconstant modular form (in particular, holomorphic eta quotients) has positive weight. So, the weights of the factors of a reducible holomorphic eta quotient f is bounded above by the weight of f. Since eta quotients do not have poles or zeros on $\mathfrak{H}$, from the valence formula it also follows that there are only finitely many holomorphic eta quotients of a fixed pair of weight and level (see (3.12)). But a priori we do not know how large the level of an arbitrary factor of f might be. Thus, scenarios like (1.8) create a primary obstacle to algorithmic determination of irreducibility of holomorphic eta quotients. However, this obstacle is surmountable. In other words, the levels of the factors of a given holomorphic eta quotient can not be arbitrarily large (see Lemma 1 below). Here we shall provide an explicit upper bound for the minimum of the levels of the nontrivial factors of a reducible holomorphic eta quotient (see Theorem 2 and Corollary 4 below).

An *eta quotient on* $\Gamma_0(M)$ is an eta quotient whose level divides M. Let f, g and h be nonconstant holomorphic eta quotients on $\Gamma_0(M)$ such that $f = g \times h$. Then we say that f is *factorizable on* $\Gamma_0(M)$. From the data obtained through lots of numerical experiments, I observed:

Conjecture 1 (Reducibility Conjecture)**.** *Any reducible holomorphic eta quotient of level N is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N)$.*

For example, the eta quotient of level 6 in (1.8) also has the following factorization into holomorphic eta quotients of level 6 and level 2:

$$\frac{\eta\eta_2\eta_6}{\eta_3} = \frac{\eta^2\eta_6}{\eta_2\eta_3} \times \frac{\eta_2^2}{\eta}. \tag{1.9}$$

So, the eta quotient $\dfrac{\eta\eta_2\eta_6}{\eta_3}$ is indeed factorizable on $\Gamma_0(6)$. The above conjecture in particular, holds trivially for $N = 1$.

Let us compare the situation with that of modular forms (with the trivial multiplier system). The notions of irreducibility and factorizability also makes sense if we replace "holomorphic eta quotients" with "modular forms" above. For $k \in 2\mathbb{N}$, we define the Eisenstein series E_k by

$$E_k(z) := 1 - \frac{2k}{B_k}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sigma_{k-1}(n)q^n, \tag{1.10}$$

where the function $\sigma_{k-1} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is given by

$$\sigma_{k-1}(n) := \sum_{d|n} d^{k-1} \tag{1.11}$$

and the k-th Bernoulli number B_k is defined by

$$\frac{t}{e^t-1}=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{B_k}{k!}\cdot t^k. \tag{1.12}$$

For each even integer $k>2$, E_k is a modular form of weight k on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ (see [43]). Since there are no nonzero modular forms of odd weight or weight 2 on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, neither E_4 nor E_6 is factorizable on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. The valence formula (3.10) for $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ implies that for each $t\in\mathbb{C}^*$, $E_4^3+tE_6^2$ only has a simple zero on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\backslash(\mathfrak{H}\cup\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}))$. Hence, for no such t, the modular form above is factorizable on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$.

By $X_0(N)$, we denote the compact modular curve $\Gamma_0(N)\backslash(\mathfrak{H}\cup\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}))$. The index of $\Gamma_0(N)$ in $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ is given by

$$\psi(N):=N\cdot\prod_{\substack{p|N\\ p\text{ prime}}}\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right) \tag{1.13}$$

(see [17]). For $N|4$, there exists a bijection between $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ and $X_0(N)$. For example, given a pair of linearly independent modular forms f and g of weight k on $\Gamma_0(N)$, where $k\in\mathbb{N}$ is such that $k\cdot\psi(N)=12$, the following map (see [43]) gives such a bijection:

$$[\alpha:\beta]\mapsto x_0\in X_0(N)\text{ if }\alpha f-\beta g\text{ vanishes at }x_0.$$

Both the well-definedness of the above map and the fact that it is a bijection follow again from the valence formula (3.10). Using such bijections, it is easy to deduce that for $N|4$, every modular form on $\Gamma_0(N)$ has a unique factorization of the form:

$$C_0E_4^aE_6^b\prod_{t\in\mathbb{C}\smallsetminus\{0\}}(E_4^3+tE_6^2)^{n_t}\text{ for }N=1, \tag{1.14}$$

$$C_0e_{2,2}^a\left(\frac{\eta_2^{16}}{\eta^8}\right)^b\prod_{t\in\mathbb{C}\smallsetminus\{64\}}\left(\frac{\eta^{16}}{\eta_2^8}+t\frac{\eta_2^{16}}{\eta^8}\right)^{n_t}\text{ for }N=2, \tag{1.15}$$

$$C_0\left(\frac{\eta_4^8}{\eta_2^4}\right)^a\prod_{t\in\mathbb{C}}\left(\frac{\eta^8}{\eta_2^4}+t\frac{\eta_4^8}{\eta_2^4}\right)^{n_t}\text{ for }N=4, \tag{1.16}$$

where $C_0\in\mathbb{C}$ and a,b,n_t are some nonnegative integers such that n_t is zero for all but finitely many t. In (1.15), by $e_{2,2}$ we denote the unique monic modular form (i. e. which has a q-expansion of the form $1+O(q)$) of weight 2 on $\Gamma_0(2)$, defined by $e_{2,2}(z):=2E_2(2z)-E_2(z)$ for all $z\in\mathfrak{H}$. The holomorphy of the eta quotients in the above linear combinations follows trivially from (3.17), once one notes the outermost columns of the matrix in (3.19). The triviality of the multiplier systems of these eta quotients follows from Newman's criteria (see [34], [35] or [39]). In particular, (1.16) implies that every modular form on $\Gamma_0(4)$ is a linear combination of holomorphic eta quotients of the form $\eta^{8a}\eta_4^{8b}/\eta_2^{4(a+b)}$, where a and b are nonnegative integers (see Problem 1.68 in [36], Section 3 in [6] and Section 2 in [39]).

From above, we conclude that for $N|4$, every modular form on $\Gamma_0(N)$ of weight greater than $12/\psi(N)$ is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N)$. Also, from Manin-Drinfeld theorem (see [30],[18]), it follows that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a $k_N \in \mathbb{N}$, such that if any modular form f of weight greater than k_N on $\Gamma_0(N)$ has all its zeros only at the cusps, then f is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N)$. In particular, (1.16) implies that every modular form of weight greater than 2 on $\Gamma_0(4)$ is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(4)$. However, since the minimum of the weights of nonconstant modular forms (with the trivial multiplier system) is 2, any the modular form of weight 2 is irreducible. For example, the modular form on $\Gamma_0(N)$ defined by

$$NE_2(Nz) - E_2(z) \tag{1.17}$$

(see [17]) is irreducible for all $N > 1$. Since $\Gamma_0(4) \subset \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ and since there are no modular forms of weight 2 on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, it follows that every modular form on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(4)$ (see [5] for some nontrivial factors of E_4, E_6 and $E_4^3 + tE_6^2$ for all $t \in \mathbb{C}^*$ on $\Gamma_0(4)$). So, the analog of the Reducibility Conjecture does not hold for modular forms in general: Though every modular form on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ is reducible, but there are modular forms on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ which are not factorizable on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$.

Given $x_0 \in X_0(N)$, if there exists a modular form $f_{x_0,N}$ on $\Gamma_0(N)$ which vanishes nowhere on $X_0(N)$ except at x_0 such that $f_{x_0,N}$ has the least order of vanishing among all the modular forms on $\Gamma_0(N)$ which vanishes only at x_0, then clearly, $f_{x_0,N}$ is not factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N)$. In particular, from the invertibility of the order matrix (see (3.15)), it follows that both $f_{0,N}$ and $f_{\infty,N}$ are given by eta quotients for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. More precisely, $f_{0,N}$ (resp. $f_{\infty,N}$) is the least positive integer power of $\prod_{d|N} \eta_d^{B_N(d,1)}$ (resp. $\prod_{d|N} \eta_d^{B_N(d,N)}$), which satisfies Newman's criteria (see [34], [35] or [39]), where B_N is as defined in (6.3). Proceeding in this way or by an easy generalization a result from [40], we obtain that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all primes $p \geq 5$, we have

$$f_{0,p^n} = \left(\frac{\eta^p}{\eta_p}\right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad f_{\infty,p^n} = \left(\frac{\eta_{p^n}^p}{\eta_{p^{n-1}}}\right)^2. \tag{1.18}$$

In particular, for each prime $p \geq 5$, the modular form $(\eta^p/\eta_p)^2$ of weight $p-1$ is not factorizable on $\Gamma_0(p^n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. More generally, it follows by a similar argument that for all odd $N \in \mathbb{N}$ divisible by m distinct primes and for B_N as defined in (6.3), the modular form

$$\Big(\prod_{d|N} \eta_d^{B_N(d,1)}\Big)^{\max\{1,3-m\}} \tag{1.19}$$

is not factorizable on $\Gamma_0(M)$ for any multiple M of N, whose set of prime divisors is the same as that of N. However, the lack of an analog of the level lowering map (see Lemma 2 and Lemma 3) which preserves weight for modular forms in general, prevents us from concluding that the above modular form is irreducible.

It is still unknown whether any examples of "irreducible modular forms" of weight greater than 2 exists. On the contrary, it follows from Corollary 2 below (or from Theorem 3 in [5]) that there exist irreducible holomorphic eta

quotients of arbitrarily large weights. We shall also see some irreducibility criteria for holomorphic eta quotients in [8].

We call a holomorphic eta quotient f of level N *quasi-irreducible*, if it is not factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N)$. The Reducibility Conjecture (Conjecture 1) has an immediate consequence in checking irreducibility of holomorphic eta quotients, since its contrapositive states:

Conjecture 1′. *Every quasi-irreducible holomorphic eta quotient is irreducible.*

Since factorizability of a holomorphic eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$ is algorithmically determinable (see Algorithm 1 below), the truth of the Reducibility Conjecture would supply us with an easy way to check irreducibility of a holomorphic eta quotient:

Algorithm 1 (Checking factorizability on $\Gamma_0(M)$)**.** If a holomorphic eta quotient f is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(M)$, then there exists a holomorphic eta quotient $g \notin \{1, f\}$ on $\Gamma_0(M)$, such that

$$\operatorname{ord}_s(g;\Gamma_0(M)) \leq \operatorname{ord}_s(f;\Gamma_0(M))$$

at all cusps s of $\Gamma_0(M)$ (see (3.8)). Since eta quotients do not have zeros or poles on the upper half-plane, the valence formula (3.10) implies that the eta quotient g is uniquely determined by its orders at the cusps of $\Gamma_0(M)$. Since $\operatorname{ord}_s(g;\Gamma_0(M)) \in \frac{1}{24}\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ for all cusps s of $\Gamma_0(M)$ (see (3.7)) and since $\Gamma_0(M)$ has only finitely many cusps, it follows that the search for such a g halts after a finite amount of time.

The naive algorithm given above could be improved by using (3.9) and by implementing standard linear algebraic techniques for finding a suitable lattice point (if any) in the relevant compact subset (see [5]) of the cone generated by the columns of the inverse of the order matrix A_M (see (3.15), (3.18) and (3.19)).

There are also other interesting consequences of the Reducibility Conjecture. For example, a lot of numerical evidence suggest the truth of the following assertion:

Conjecture 2 (Irreducibility Conjecture)**.** *The rescalings of an irreducible holomorphic eta quotient by positive integers are irreducible.*

In Corollary 15 below, we shall see that the above conjecture is equivalent to the following which in turn, follows from the Reducibility Conjecture (see Corollary 14):

Conjecture 2′ (Irreducibility Conjecture, alternative form)**.** *The images of an irreducible holomorphic eta quotient under the Atkin-Lehner involutions are irreducible.*

We shall briefly recall the Atkin-Lehner involutions in Section 3. We call an eta quotient *primitive* if it is not a rescaling of some other eta quotient by a positive integer. We define the *extract* of an eta quotient f as the primitive eta quotient f_0 of which f is a rescaling by a positive integer. Now, Conjecture 2 implies the following restatement of Conjecture 1′:

Conjecture 1″. *A holomorphic eta quotient is irreducible if its extract is quasi-irreducible.*

2. The results

Our first result says that a holomorphic eta quotients f is irreducible, if there does not exist any nontrivial factor of f up to sufficiently large levels:

Theorem 1. *The levels of all the factors of a quasi-irreducible holomorphic eta quotient f are bounded above with respect to the level of f.*

It follows from Mersmann's finiteness theorem (1.6) that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an $M \in \mathbb{N}$ which is divisible by the levels of all primitive and irreducible holomorphic eta quotients of weights less than or equal to $k/2$. For a given k, we call the least such M the *k-th Mersmann level* and denote it by M_k.

Theorem 1 follows from the finiteness of quasi-irreducible holomorphic eta quotients (which is an implication of (3.14) below) and from the following lemma which we shall prove in Section 4:

Lemma 1. *Let $k, N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq 2$ and let f be a holomorphic eta quotient of weight $k/2$ and level N. Then the levels of the factors of f divide $\operatorname{lcm}(N, M_{k-1})$, where M_{k-1} is the $(k-1)$-th Mersmann level.*

For example, since $M_1 = 12$ (see [32], [43] or [7]), the above lemma implies that if f is a holomorphic eta quotient of weight 1 and level N, then the level of each factor of f divides $\operatorname{lcm}(N, 12)$. In particular, any quasi-irreducible holomorphic eta quotient of weight 1 and level 12 is irreducible. Also, note that the level of any factor of the holomorphic eta quotient $\eta\eta_2\eta_6/\eta_3$ can not be higher than 12 (see (1.8)).

At present, the k-th Mersmann level is not explicitly known for any $k > 1$. Though the proof of Mersmann's finiteness theorem (see [32] or [6]) supplies us with a way to compute an upper bound for M_k, but the immense amount of operations necessary to compute this bound even for small values of k renders this algorithm practically useless (see also the remark after Theorem 1.2 in [28]). So, we shall circumvent altogether the use of Lemma 1 to obtain an effective result about the level of a nontrivial factor of a reducible holomorphic eta quotient (see Corollary 4 below). Besides, we shall show that the Reducibility Conjecture holds for eta quotients of prime power levels:

Theorem 2. *For a prime p and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, any reducible holomorphic eta quotient of level p^n is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(p^n)$.*

For example, it is easy to show that η^p/η_p is a quasi-irreducible holomorphic eta quotient for any prime p (see Lemma 3 in [5] or Lemma 2.3 in [9]). Hence, by Theorem 2, it is irreducible (this follows also from Theorem 3 in [5]). Thus, we see that there exist irreducible holomorphic eta quotients of arbitrarily large weights. In particular, the above theorem implies (see Section 8) that the Irreducibility Conjecture also holds for eta quotients of prime power levels:

Corollary 1. *Let f be an irreducible holomorphic eta quotient of a prime power level. Then the rescalings of f by the positive integers as well as the images of f under the Atkin-Lehner involutions are irreducible.*

Since η^p/η_p is irreducible, Corollary 1 implies:

Corollary 2. *For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all prime p, the holomorphic eta quotients*

$$\frac{\eta_m^p}{\eta_{pm}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\eta_{pm}^p}{\eta_m}$$

are irreducible. □

Theorem 2 is a consequence of the following general result (see Section 7), which we shall prove in Sections 5 and 6. For a divisor d of N, we say that d *exactly divides* N and write $d\|N$ if $\gcd(d, N/d) = 1$.

Theorem 3. *Let $N > 1$ be an integer and let f be a reducible holomorphic eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$.*

(a) *Then there exists a multiple M of N with $\mathrm{rad}(M) = \mathrm{rad}(M)$ such that f is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(M)$. Here $\mathrm{rad} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ denotes the function that maps an integer to the product of its distinct prime divisors.*

(b) *Let $M > N$ be as above and suppose there exists a factor g of f on $\Gamma_0(M)$ such that the exponent of η_{tM/N_0} in g is nonzero for some $t|N_0$, where N_0 is the greatest common exact divisor of M and N. Let $M_0 := M/N$. If*

$$M_0 \geq 2^{\omega(M_0)-1}\mathrm{rad}(M_0)\widehat{\varphi}(N_0), \tag{2.1}$$

then f has a factor of weight greater than or equal to $\varphi(\mathrm{rad}(N))/2$ on $\Gamma_0(N)$. Moreover, if strict inequality holds in (2.1), then this factor of f is nontrivial. Here $\omega(M_0)$ denotes the number of distinct prime divisors of M_0, φ denotes Euler's totient function and the function $\widehat{\varphi} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(N) := N\prod_{p\in\wp_N}\Big(p - \frac{1}{p}\Big), \tag{2.2}$$

where $\wp_N$ denotes the set of prime divisors of N.

Finally, with the help of the above theorem and a result of Mersmann / Rouse-Webb (see (3.13) and refer to [32], [39] or [6] for details), we obtain an explicit upper bound for the minimum of the levels of the nontrivial factors of a reducible holomorphic eta quotient:

Theorem 4. *Let $k, N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ and let f be a reducible holomorphic eta quotient of weight $k/2$ and level N. Let M be the least positive integer such that f is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(M)$. Then we have*

$$M \leq (2Nk)^{2^{R_{k-1}(N)-1}}\Upsilon(R_{k-1}(N)). \tag{2.3}$$

and $\mathrm{rad}(M) = \mathrm{rad}(N)$. Here $\Upsilon : \mathbb{R}_{>1} \to \mathbb{N}$ and $R_k : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{Q}$ are defined by

$$\Upsilon(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x < 2 \\ \displaystyle\prod_{\substack{j\in\mathbb{N}\\ j\leq x-1}} (x-j)^{2^{j-1}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$R_k(N) := k \prod_{\substack{p\in\wp_N\\ p^m\|N}} \Big(\frac{p+1}{p-1}\Big)^{\min\{2,m\}}, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\wp_N$ denotes the set of prime divisors of N.

Corollary 3. *Irreducibility of a holomorphic eta quotient is algorithmically determinable.* □

We shall prove Theorem 4 in Section 9. From the finiteness of quasi-irreducible holomorphic eta quotients (see (3.14)), it follows that there exists a function $\rho_{\max} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho_{\max}(N)/2$ is the maximum of the weights of the quasi-irreducible holomorphic eta quotients of level N. In particular, the above theorem remains true if we replace k with $\rho_{\max}(N)$ in it. Let $\wp_N$ denote the set of prime divisors of N. Below in (3.14), we shall also see that the function $\kappa : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, defined by

$$\kappa(N) := \varphi\left(\mathrm{rad}(N)\right) \prod_{\substack{p\in\wp_N\\ p^m\|N}} \big((m-1)(p-1)+2\big) \tag{2.6}$$

satisfies the inequality: $\rho_{\max}(N) \le \kappa(N)$ for all N. Hence, from Theorem 4 we conclude:

Corollary 4. *Let $N > 1$ be an integer and let f be a reducible holomorphic eta quotient of level N. Let M be the least positive integer such that f is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(M)$. Then we have*

$$M \le (2N\kappa(N))^{2^{R(N)-1}} \Upsilon(R(N)) \tag{2.7}$$

and $\mathrm{rad}(M) = \mathrm{rad}(N)$. Here $\Upsilon : \mathbb{R}_{>1} \to \mathbb{N}$ is as defined in (2.4), $\kappa : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is as defined in (2.6) and $R(N) := R_{\kappa(N)-1}(N)$ is defined by (2.5). □

3. Notations and the basic facts

By $\mathbb{N}$ we denote the set of positive integers. We define the operation $\odot : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ by

$$d_1 \odot d_2 := \frac{\mathrm{lcm}(d_1, d_2)}{\gcd(d_1, d_2)}. \tag{3.1}$$

For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, by $\mathcal{D}_N$ (resp. $\mathcal{E}_N$) we denote the set of divisors (resp. exact divisors) of N. It follows trivially that $(\mathcal{E}_N, \odot)$ is a boolean group (i. e. each element of $\mathcal{E}_N$ is the inverse of itself) and that $\mathcal{E}_N$ acts on $\mathcal{D}_N$ by $\odot$. For $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$, we define the eta quotient η^X by

$$\eta^X := \prod_{d\in\mathcal{D}_N} \eta_d^{X_d}, \tag{3.2}$$

where X_d is the value of X at $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$ whereas η_d denotes the rescaling of η by d. Clearly, the level of η^X divides N. In other words, η^X transforms like a modular form on $\Gamma_0(N)$. For $N, k \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\mathbb{E}^!_{N,k}$ (resp. $\mathbb{E}_{N,k}$) be the set

of eta quotients (resp. holomorphic eta quotients) of weight $k/2$ on $\Gamma_0(N)$. For $n \in \mathcal{E}_N$, we define the *Atkin-Lehner map* $\mathrm{al}_{n,N} : \mathbb{E}^!_{N,k} \to \mathbb{E}^!_{N,k}$ by

$$\mathrm{al}_{n,N}\Big(\prod_{d\in\mathcal{D}_N} \eta_d^{X_d}\Big) := \prod_{d\in\mathcal{D}_N} \eta_{n\odot d}^{X_d}. \tag{3.3}$$

Since $\mathcal{E}_N$ is a boolean group and since it acts on $\mathcal{D}_N$ by $\odot$, it follows trivially that the map $\mathrm{al}_{n,N} : \mathbb{E}^!_{N,k} \to \mathbb{E}^!_{N,k}$ is an involution. It is easy to show that the above definition is compatible with the usual definition (see [2]) of Atkin-Lehner involutions of modular forms on $\Gamma_0(N)$ up to multiplication by a complex number (see the Preliminaries in [9]). So in particular, if f is an eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$ and $n \in \mathcal{E}_N$, then f is holomorphic if and only if so is $\mathrm{al}_{n,N}(f)$.

Recall that a holomorphic eta quotient f on $\Gamma_0(N)$ is an eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$ that does not have any poles at the cusps. Under the action of $\Gamma_0(N)$ on $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$ by Möbius transformation, for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, we have

$$[a : b] \sim_{\Gamma_0(N)} [a' : \gcd(N, b)] \tag{3.4}$$

for some $a' \in \mathbb{Z}$ which is coprime to $\gcd(N, b)$ (see [17]). We identify $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$ with $\mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$ via the canonical bijection that maps $[\alpha : \lambda]$ to α/λ if $\lambda \neq 0$ and to ∞ if $\lambda = 0$. For $s \in \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$ and a weakly holomorphic modular form f on $\Gamma_0(N)$, the order of f at the cusp s of $\Gamma_0(N)$ is the exponent of q^{1/w_s} occurring with the first nonzero coefficient in the q-expansion of f at the cusp s, where w_s is the width of the cusp s (see [17], [38]). Hence in particular, for $N|N'$, we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_s(f; \Gamma_0(N')) = \frac{w'_s}{w_s} \cdot \mathrm{ord}_s(f; \Gamma_0(N)), \tag{3.5}$$

where w_s (resp. w'_s) is the width of the cusp s of $\Gamma_0(N)$ (resp. $\Gamma_0(N')$). The following is a minimal set of representatives of the cusps of $\Gamma_0(N)$ (see [17], [31]):

$$\mathcal{S}_N := \Big\{ \frac{a}{t} \in \mathbb{Q} \;\Big|\; t \in \mathcal{D}_N,\, a \in \mathbb{Z},\, \gcd(a, t) = 1 \Big\} / \sim, \tag{3.6}$$

where $\dfrac{a}{t} \sim \dfrac{b}{t}$ if and only if $a \equiv b \pmod{\gcd(t, N/t)}$. For $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and for $s = \dfrac{a}{t} \in \mathcal{S}_N$ with $\gcd(a, t) = 1$, we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_s(\eta_d; \Gamma_0(N)) = \frac{N \cdot \gcd(d, t)^2}{24 \cdot d \cdot \gcd(t^2, N)} \in \frac{1}{24}\mathbb{N} \tag{3.7}$$

(see [31]). It is easy to check the above inclusion when N is a prime power. The general case follows by multiplicativity (see (3.15) and (3.18)). From (3.7), it follows that for all $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$, we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_s(\eta^X; \Gamma_0(N)) = \frac{1}{24} \sum_{d\in\mathcal{D}_N} \frac{N \cdot \gcd(d, t)^2}{d \cdot \gcd(t^2, N)} X_d\,. \tag{3.8}$$

In particular, that implies

$$\mathrm{ord}_{a/t}(\eta^X; \Gamma_0(N)) = \mathrm{ord}_{1/t}(\eta^X; \Gamma_0(N)) \tag{3.9}$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and for all the $\varphi(\gcd(t, N/t))$ inequivalent cusps of $\Gamma_0(N)$ represented by rational numbers of the form $\frac{a}{t} \in \mathcal{S}_N$ with $\gcd(a, t) = 1$, where φ denotes Euler's totient function.

The *valence formula* for $\Gamma_0(N)$ (see [4]) states:

$$\sum_{P \in \Gamma_0(N) \backslash \mathfrak{H}} \frac{1}{n_P} \cdot \mathrm{ord}_P(f) + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_N} \mathrm{ord}_s(f; \Gamma_0(N)) = \frac{k \cdot \psi(N)}{24}, \tag{3.10}$$

where $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\psi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is as defined in (1.13), $f : \mathfrak{H} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a meromorphic function which transforms like a modular form of weight $k/2$ with an arbitrary multiplier system on $\Gamma_0(N)$ and f is also meromorphic at the cusps of $\Gamma_0(N)$. Here by n_P, we denote the number of elements in the stabilizer of P in the group $\Gamma_0(N)/\{\pm I\}$ and by $\mathcal{S}_N$, we denote a minimal set of representatives of the cusps of $\Gamma_0(N)$.

For a meromorphic function $f : \mathfrak{H} \to \mathbb{C}$ which transforms like a modular form on $\Gamma_0(N)$, let Π_f denote the product of all the images of f under the operations by the elements of a minimal set of right coset representatives of $\Gamma_0(N)$ in $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Then Π_f transforms like a modular form on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. It is easy to check that if the valence formula holds for Π_f, then it also holds for f. Thus, the case for an arbitrary N in (3.10) reduces to the case $N = 1$ which in turn, follows from contour integration of the logarithmic derivative of Π_f along the boundary of a fundamental domain for $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ (see [38]).

In particular, if f is an eta quotient, then from (3.10) we obtain

$$\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_N} \mathrm{ord}_s(f; \Gamma_0(N)) = \frac{k \cdot \psi(N)}{24}, \tag{3.11}$$

because eta quotients do not have poles or zeros on $\mathfrak{H}$. It follows from (3.11), (3.6) and (3.9) that for an eta quotient f of weight $k/2$ on $\Gamma_0(N)$, the valence formula further reduces to

$$\sum_{t \mid N} \varphi(\gcd(t, N/t)) \cdot \mathrm{ord}_{1/t}(f; \Gamma_0(N)) = \frac{k \cdot \psi(N)}{24}, \tag{3.12}$$

where φ denotes Euler's totient function. Since $\mathrm{ord}_{1/t}(f; \Gamma_0(N)) \in \frac{1}{24}\mathbb{Z}$ (see (3.7)), from (3.12) we conclude that the number of holomorphic eta quotients of weight $k/2$ on $\Gamma_0(N)$ is at most the number of solutions of the equation $\sum_{t|N} \varphi(\gcd(t, N/t)) \cdot x_t = k \cdot \psi(N)$ in nonnegative integers x_t.

Also, the following result of Mersmann / Rouse-Webb (see [32], Theorem 2 in [39] or Corollary 1 in [6]) implies an upper bound on the number of such eta quotients:

(3.13) *For $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$, let η^X be a holomorphic eta quotient of weight $k/2$ on $\Gamma_0(N)$. Then we have $\|X\| \leq R_k(N)$.*

Here $\|X\| := \sum_d |X_d|$ and the function $R_k : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{Q}$ is as defined in (2.5). Moreover, if the holomorphic eta quotient η^X is not factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N)$, then the following stronger version of the analog of Zagier's conjecture (1.7) (see Theorem 1 in [5]) implies that $\|X\|$ is bounded above by a function of

only N:

(3.14) *The number of holomorphic eta quotients on $\Gamma_0(N)$ which are not factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N)$ is finite and the weight of any such eta quotient is less than or equal to $\kappa(N)/2$, where the equality holds only if $N = 1$.*

Here the function $\kappa : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is as defined in (2.6).

We define the *order map* $\mathcal{O}_N : \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N} \to \frac{1}{24}\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$ of level N as the map which sends $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$ to the ordered set of orders of the eta quotient η^X at the cusps $\{1/t\}_{t\in\mathcal{D}_N}$ of $\Gamma_0(N)$. Also, we define the *order matrix* $A_N \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N\times\mathcal{D}_N}$ of level N by

$$A_N(t,d) := 24 \cdot \mathrm{ord}_{1/t}(\eta_d; \Gamma_0(N)) \tag{3.15}$$

for all $t, d \in \mathcal{D}_N$. For example, for a prime power p^n, we have

$$A_{p^n} = \begin{pmatrix} p^n & p^{n-1} & p^{n-2} & \cdots & p & 1 \\ p^{n-2} & p^{n-1} & p^{n-2} & \cdots & p & 1 \\ p^{n-4} & p^{n-3} & p^{n-2} & \cdots & p & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & p & p^2 & \cdots & p^{n-1} & p^{n-2} \\ 1 & p & p^2 & \cdots & p^{n-1} & p^n \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.16}$$

By linearity of the order map, we have

$$\mathcal{O}_N(X) = \frac{1}{24} \cdot A_N X\,. \tag{3.17}$$

For $r \in \mathbb{N}$, if $Y, Y' \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N^r}$ is such that $Y - Y'$ is nonnegative at each element of $\mathcal{D}_N^r$, then we write $Y \geq Y'$. In particular, for $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$, the eta quotient η^X is holomorphic if and only if $A_N X \geq 0$.

From (3.15) and (3.7), we note that $A_N(t,d)$ is multiplicative in N, t and d. Hence, it follows that

$$A_N = \bigotimes_{\substack{p^n \| N \\ p \text{ prime}}} A_{p^n}, \tag{3.18}$$

where by $\otimes$, we denote the Kronecker product of matrices.*

*Kronecker product of matrices is not commutative. However, since any given ordering of the primes dividing N induces a lexicographic ordering on $\mathcal{D}_N$ with which the entries of A_N are indexed, Equation (3.18) makes sense for all possible orderings of the primes dividing N.

It is easy to verify that for a prime power p^n, the matrix A_{p^n} is invertible with the tridiagonal inverse:

$$A_{p^n}^{-1} = \frac{1}{p^n \cdot (p - \frac{1}{p})} \begin{pmatrix} p & -p & & & & \\ -1 & p^2+1 & -p^2 & & 0 & \\ & -p & p\cdot(p^2+1) & -p^3 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & 0 & & -p^2 & p^2+1 & -1 \\ & & & & -p & p \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.19}$$

where for each positive integer $j < n$, the nonzero entries of the column $A_{p^n}^{-1}(_\,, p^j)$ are the same as those of the column $A_{p^n}^{-1}(_\,, p)$ shifted down by $j-1$ entries and multiplied with $p^{\min\{j-1, n-j-1\}}$. More precisely,

$$\widehat{\varphi}(p^n) \cdot A_{p^n}^{-1}(p^i, p^j) = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } i = j = 0 \text{ or } i = j = n \\ -p^{\min\{j, n-j\}} & \text{if } |i-j| = 1 \\ p^{\min\{j-1, n-j-1\}} \cdot (p^2+1) & \text{if } 0 < i = j < n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{3.20}$$

where $\widehat{\varphi}$ is as defined in (2.2). For general N, the invertibility of the matrix A_N now follows by (3.18). Hence, any eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$ is uniquely determined by its orders at the set of the cusps $\{1/t\}_{t \in \mathcal{D}_N}$ of $\Gamma_0(N)$. In particular, for distinct $X, X' \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$, we have $\eta^X \neq \eta^{X'}$. The last statement is also implied by the uniqueness of q-series expansion: Let $\eta^{\widehat{X}}$ and $\eta^{\widehat{X}'}$ be the *eta products* (i. e. $\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}' \geq 0$) obtained by multiplying η^X and $\eta^{X'}$ with a common denominator. The claim follows by induction on the weight of $\eta^{\widehat{X}}$ (or equivalently, the weight of $\eta^{\widehat{X}'}$) when we compare the corresponding first two exponents of q occurring in the q-series expansions of $\eta^{\widehat{X}}$ and $\eta^{\widehat{X}'}$.

We define $\mathbb{1}_N$ and $\mathfrak{a}_N \in \mathbb{Q}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$ by

$$\mathbb{1}_N(t) := 1 \text{ for all } t \in \mathcal{D}_N \text{ and } \mathfrak{a}_N := (A_N^{-1})^{\mathrm{T}}\, \mathbb{1}_N. \tag{3.21}$$

Comparing (3.17) with (3.12) and recalling that for $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$, the weight the eta quotient η^X is $\frac{1}{2}\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}_N} X_d$, we get

$$\mathfrak{a}_N(t) = \frac{\varphi(\gcd(t, N/t))}{\psi(N)} \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathcal{D}_N. \tag{3.22}$$

Equation (3.22) also follows directly from (3.19) and (3.18). So, rather than obtaining (3.12) as a corollary to the valence formula for $\Gamma_0(N)$, one could also deduce it from (3.17) and (3.22) (see the Preliminaries in [9]).

Next, we briefly recall *eta quotients with rational exponents* (see [22]). We define $L : \mathfrak{H} \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$L(z) := \frac{\pi i z}{12} + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \log(1 - e^{2\pi i n z}) = \frac{\pi i z}{12} - \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{2\pi i m n z}}{m}. \tag{3.23}$$

The double series above converges absolutely and uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathfrak{H}$. So, L is holomorphic on $\mathfrak{H}$. Also, L exhibits a nice transformation behaviour under the action of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ on $\mathfrak{H}$, from which the modular transformation property $\eta = e^L$ follows (See [37]). For $X \in \mathbb{Q}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$, we define

$$\eta^X := \prod_{d \in \mathcal{D}_N} e^{X_d L_d}, \tag{3.24}$$

where X_d is the value of X at $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$ whereas L_d denotes the rescaling of L by d. The modularity of η^X under $\Gamma_0(N)$ again follows from the transformation property of L (see the Preliminaries in [9]). In particular, holomorphic eta quotients with rational exponents provide us with examples of modular forms of arbitrary rational weights.

Let f be an eta quotient with fractional exponents on $\Gamma_0(N)$. Then there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g := f^n$ is an eta quotient with integer coefficients. Naturally, the order of f at a cusp s of $\Gamma_0(N)$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{ord}_s(f;\Gamma_0(N)) := \frac{\mathrm{ord}_s(g;\Gamma_0(N))}{n}. \tag{3.25}$$

4. Proof of Theorem 1

Theorem 1 follows immediately from (3.14) and Lemma 1. We prove this lemma in the following:

Proof of Lemma 1. The claim holds trivially if f is irreducible. So, let us assume that f is reducible. We proceed by induction on the weight of f. So, first we consider the case where f is of weight 1. Since f is reducible, there exist nonconstant holomorphic eta quotients g and h such that $f = g \times h$. Since f is of weight 1 and since the weight of any nonconstant holomorphic eta quotient is at least $1/2$, both g and h must be of weight $1/2$. Let $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$ be such that $f = \eta^X$ and let $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$ be such that X_d is nonzero. Then the exponent of η_d in either g or h must also be nonzero. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the exponent of η_d in g is nonzero. Let g_0 denote the extract of g. Since the weight of any nonconstant holomorphic eta quotient is at least $1/2$, each eta quotient of weight $1/2$ is irreducible. In particular, so is g_0. Since g_0 is a primitive irreducible holomorphic eta quotient of weight $1/2$, it follows from Mersmann's finiteness theorem (1.6) that the level of g_0 divides the 1st Mersmann level M_1. Since g is a rescaling of g_0 by some divisor of d, the level of g divides $\mathrm{lcm}(d, M_1)$. Since the level of h must divide the least common multiple of the levels of f and g, it follows that the level of h is a divisor of $\mathrm{lcm}(N, M_1)$. Thus, the claim holds in the weight 1 case.

Let us assume that the claim holds for all the cases where f is of weight less than or equal to $k_0/2$ for some integer $k_0 \geq 2$. Now, consider the case where f is of weight $(k_0+1)/2$. Since f is reducible, there exist nonconstant holomorphic eta quotients g and h such that $f = g \times h$. Let $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$ be such that $f = \eta^X$ and let $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$ be such that X_d is nonzero. Then the exponent of η_d in either g or h must also be nonzero. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the exponent of η_d in g is nonzero. Then there exists an irreducible factor of g' of g such that the exponent of η_d in g' is nonzero.

Since $g' \neq f$, the weight of g' is at most $k_0/2$. Since g' is irreducible, so is its extract g'_0. Since g'_0 is a primitive irreducible holomorphic eta quotient of weight at most $k_0/2$, it follows from Mersmann's finiteness theorem (1.6) that the level of g'_0 divides the k_0-th Mersmann level M_{k_0}. Since g' is a rescaling of g'_0 by some divisor of d, the level of g' divides $\operatorname{lcm}(d, M_{k_0})$. Since the level of $h' := f/g'$ must divide the least common multiple of the levels of f and g', it follows that the level of h' is a divisor of $\operatorname{lcm}(N, M_{k_0})$. Since the weight of h' is at most $k_0/2$, it follows from the induction hypothesis that the level of each factor of h' is a divisor of $\operatorname{lcm}(N, M_{k_0})$. In particular, since $h' = h \times g/g'$, both the levels of h and $g = g' \times g/g'$ divide $\operatorname{lcm}(N, M_{k_0})$. Thus, the level of each factor of f divides $\operatorname{lcm}(N, M_{k_0})$. □

5. Level reduction of the factors

In this section, we shall show that given a factorization of a holomorphic eta quotient f of the form $f = g \times h$, we can trim the levels of g and h off the primes which does not divide N by constructing a pair of holomorphic eta quotients $\widetilde{g}$ and $\widetilde{h}$ such that $f = \widetilde{g} \times \widetilde{h}$, where all the prime divisors of the levels of $\widetilde{g}$ and $\widetilde{h}$ divide N (see Lemma 3). Thus, the assertion in Theorem 3.(a) would follow. We shall also see some applications of the map which we construct here in Section 9.

For $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N \in \mathcal{D}_M$, we define the linear map $\mathcal{P}_{M,N} : \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M} \to \mathbb{Q}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$ by

$$(\mathcal{P}_{M,N}(X))_d := d \cdot \sum_{\substack{t \in \mathcal{D}_M \\ \gcd(t,N)=d}} \frac{t_d}{t} \cdot X_t \text{ for all } d \in \mathcal{D}_N. \tag{5.1}$$

Here t_d is the largest divisor of t that is coprime to d. Let $\mathbb{E}^!_M := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}^!_{M,k}$ (resp. $\mathbb{E}_M := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{E}_{M,k}$) be the group (resp. monoid) of eta quotients (resp. holomorphic eta quotients) on $\Gamma_0(M)$. Let $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}^!_M$ (resp. $\widehat{\mathbb{E}}_M$) denote the generalization of $\mathbb{E}^!_M$ (resp. $\mathbb{E}_M$) to eta quotients with rational exponents. Then for $N \in \mathcal{D}_M$, the map $\mathcal{P}_{M,N}$ induces the homomorphism $\mathrm{p}_{M,N} \colon \mathbb{E}^!_M \to \widehat{\mathbb{E}}^!_N$ given by

$$\mathrm{p}_{M,N}(\eta^X) := \eta^{\mathcal{P}_{M,N}(X)}. \tag{5.2}$$

Lemma 2. *For $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N \in \mathcal{D}_M$, let $\mathrm{p}_{M,N} \colon \mathbb{E}^!_M \to \widehat{\mathbb{E}}^!_N$ be the homomorphism defined above. Then the following statements hold:*

- (a) *If $n \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and if f is an eta quotient of level n, then $\mathrm{p}_{M,N}(f) = f$.*
- (b) *If $N \| M$, then the homomorphism $\mathrm{p}_{M,N}$ maps $\mathbb{E}^!_M$ onto $\mathbb{E}^!_N$ and moreover, $\mathrm{p}_{M,N}$ preserves weight.*
- (c) *If $N' \in \mathcal{D}_M$ such that $N' \| M$ and $N \in \mathcal{D}_{N'}$, then $\mathrm{p}_{M,N} = \mathrm{p}_{N',N} \circ \mathrm{p}_{M,N'}$.*
- (d) *For all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N \in \mathcal{D}_M$, the homomorphism $\mathrm{p}_{M,N}$ preserves holomorphy.*

Proof. (a) Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_M$ be such that $f = \eta^X$. Since f is of level n,

$$X_t = 0 \text{ for all } t \nmid n.$$

So, for $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$, we have

$$(\mathcal{P}_{M,N}(X))_d = d \cdot \sum_{\substack{t \in \mathcal{D}_M \\ \gcd(t,N)=d}} \frac{t_d}{t} \cdot X_t = \begin{cases} X_d & \text{if } d|n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where t_d is the largest divisor of t that is coprime to d. Thus, we obtain that $\mathrm{p}_{M,N}(f) = f$.
(b) Let $t \in \mathcal{D}_M$ with $(t, N) = d$. Since $N \| M$, t/d is the largest divisor of t that is coprime to d. Hence, it follows that

$$(\mathcal{P}_{M,N}(X))_d = \sum_{\substack{t \in \mathcal{D}_M \\ \gcd(t,N)=d}} X_t. \tag{5.3}$$

So, the range of $\mathrm{p}_{M,N}$ is contained in $\mathbb{E}^!_N$. The surjectivity follows from (a). The fact that $\mathrm{p}_{M,N}$ preserves weight follows from (5.3) and from the equality:

$$\sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D}_N, t \in \mathcal{D}_M \\ \gcd(t,N)=d}} X_t = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}_M} X_t,$$

which holds because $\gcd(N, M/N) = 1$.
(c) Let $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$ and let $X' := \mathcal{P}_{M,N'}(X)$. Since $N' \| M$, from (b) we get that

$$X_{t'} = \sum_{\substack{t \in \mathcal{D}_M \\ \gcd(t,N)=t'}} X_t,$$

for all $t' \in \mathcal{D}_{N'}$. Hence, for $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{P}_{N',N} \circ \mathcal{P}_{M,N'}(X))_d &= d \cdot \sum_{\substack{t' \in \mathcal{D}_{N'} \\ \gcd(t',N)=d}} \frac{t'_d}{t'} \cdot \sum_{\substack{t \in \mathcal{D}_M \\ \gcd(t,N)=t'}} X_t \\ &= d \cdot \sum_{\substack{t \in \mathcal{D}_M \\ \gcd(t,N)=d}} \frac{t_d}{t} \cdot X_t = (\mathcal{P}_{M,N}(X))_d,\end{aligned}$$

where t_d (resp. t'_d) is the largest divisor of t (resp. t') that is coprime to d. Above, the second equality follows from (5.4) below. Since $N' \| M$, the minimum positive multiple of $d \in \mathcal{D}_N \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{N'}$ that divides $t \in \mathcal{D}_M \cap d\mathbb{Z}$ exactly, is also an exact divisor of $t' = \gcd(t, N')$. Both sides of the following identity represents the reciprocal of this exact divisor:

$$\frac{t_d}{t} = \frac{t'_d}{t'}, \tag{5.4}$$

where t_d and t'_d are as before.
(d) We require to show that $\mathcal{O}_N(\mathcal{P}_{M,N}(X)) \geq 0$ if $\mathcal{O}_M(X) \geq 0$. By $P_{M,N} \in$

$\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N} \times \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$, we denote the matrix of the linear map $\mathcal{P}_{M,N}$ with respect to the canonical bases of $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$. So, for $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and $t \in \mathcal{D}_M$, we have

$$P_{M,N}(d,t) = \begin{cases} \frac{d \cdot t_d}{t} & \text{if } d = \gcd(t, N) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

where t_d is the largest divisor of t that is coprime to d. From (3.17), we get

$$\mathcal{O}_N(\mathcal{P}_{M,N}(X)) = A_N P_{M,N} A_M^{-1} \mathcal{O}_M(X).$$

Hence, it is enough to show that $A_N P_{M,N} A_M^{-1} \geq 0$. Let $M_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ be an exact divisor of M and let $N_1 := \gcd(M_1, N)$. Let $M_2 := M/M_1$ and $N_2 := N/N_1$. From (5.5), we get that

$$P_{M_1,N_1}(d_1,t_1) \cdot P_{M_2,N_2}(d_2,t_2) = P_{M,N}(d_1 d_2, t_1 t_2),$$

where $d_i \in \mathcal{D}_{N_i}$ and $t_i \in \mathcal{D}_{M_i}$ for $i \in \{1,2\}$. That implies: $P_{M,N} = P_{M_1,N_1} \otimes P_{M_2,N_2}$ or more elaborately,

$$P_{M,N} = \bigotimes_{\substack{p^m \| M,\, p^n \| N \\ p \text{ prime}}} P_{p^m,p^n}, \tag{5.6}$$

where by $\otimes$, we denote the Kronecker product of matrices.* From (3.18) and (5.6) we get that

$$A_N P_{M,N} A_M^{-1} = \bigotimes_{\substack{p^m \| M,\, p^n \| N \\ p \text{ prime}}} A_{p^n} P_{p^m,p^n} A_{p^m}^{-1},$$

Hence, it suffices to show that $A_{p^n} P_{p^m,p^n} A_{p^m}^{-1} \geq 0$ for each prime p and for all integers $m \geq n \geq 0$:

First we consider the case $m \geq n = 0$: We have $P_{p^m,1} = \mathbb{1}_{p^m}^{\mathrm{T}}$. So, from (3.21) and (3.22) we get that

$$A_1 P_{p^m,1} A_{p^m}^{-1} = \mathfrak{a}_{p^m}^{\mathrm{T}} \geq 0.$$

On the other hand, for $m \geq n > 0$, we have

$$P_{p^m,p^n} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & 0 & \\ & & 1 & & & & \\ & & & \frac{1}{p} & \frac{1}{p^2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{p^{m-n}} \\ 0 & & & & & & \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.7}$$

From (3.19), we recall that $A_{p^m}^{-1}$ is a tridiagonal matrix with columns of the form $a \cdot (p, -1, 0, \ldots, 0)^{\mathrm{T}}$, $b \cdot (0, \ldots, 0, -p, p^2+1, -p, 0, \ldots, 0)^{\mathrm{T}}$ and $c \cdot (0, \ldots, 0, -1, p)^{\mathrm{T}}$, where a, b, c are some positive rational numbers. Again, from the structures of A_{p^n} and P_{p^m,p^n} (see (3.16) and (5.7)), it is easy to note that each entry of $A_{p^n} P_{p^m,p^n}$ is of the form p^ℓ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the exponents of p in any two consecutive entries in a row of $A_{p^n} P_{p^m,p^n}$ differ

*Kronecker product of matrices is not commutative. However, since any given ordering of the primes dividing N' induces a lexicographic ordering on $\mathcal{D}_{N'}$ and $\mathcal{D}_N$ with which the entries of $P_{M,N}$ are indexed, Equation (5.6) makes sense for all possible orderings of the primes dividing N'.

by 1. It follows that each entry of $A_{p^n}P_{p^m,p^n}A_{p^m}^{-1}$ is a positive multiple of XY^{T} where $X \in \{(p^2,p,1),(1,p,1),(1,p,p^2)\}$ and $Y \in \{(p,-1,0),(-p,p^2+1,-p),(0,-1,p)\}$, i. e., X is a row of A_{p^2} and Y^{T} is a column of $A_{p^2}^{-1}$ up to a positive rational multiple. □

Corollary 5. *Let f be a holomorphic eta quotient of level N. If there exists an $N_1 \| N$ such that $\mathrm{p}_{N,N_1}(f)$ is irreducible, then f is also irreducible.*

For example, $h := \dfrac{\eta_2^2\eta_3^2\eta_5^5\eta_{12}^2\eta_{20}^5\eta_{30}^{25}}{\eta\,\eta_4\eta_6^5\eta_{10}^{10}\eta_{15}^{10}\eta_{60}^{10}}$ is a holomorphic eta quotient of level 60 and we have

$$\mathrm{p}_{60,5}(h) = \frac{\eta_5^5}{\eta}.$$

It is easy to show that η_5^5/η is quasi-irreducible (see [9]). Hence, by Theorem 2, it follows that η_5^5/η is irreducible. So, by Corollary 5, we get that h is irreducible.

Lemma 3 (Level Lowering Lemma)**.** *Let f be a holomorphic eta quotient on of level N which is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(M)$ for some $M \in N\cdot\mathbb{N}$. Let $M = mn$ with $\mathrm{rad}(n)|N$ and $(m,N)=1$. Let g be a factor of f on $\Gamma_0(M)$. Then*

$$f = \mathrm{p}_{M,n}(g) \times \mathrm{p}_{M,n}(f/g)$$

is a factorization of f on $\Gamma_0(n)$.

Proof. Clearly, we have $n\|M$. So, Lemma 2 implies that the homomorphism $\mathrm{p}_{M,n}\colon \mathbb{E}_M^! \to \mathbb{E}_n^!$ preserves both weight and holomorphy of eta quotients. Since the level of f divides n, again from Lemma 2, we obtain

$$f = \mathrm{p}_{M,n}(f) = \mathrm{p}_{M,n}(g) \times \mathrm{p}_{M,n}(h).$$

□

For example, the holomorphic eta quotient $\dfrac{\eta_2^5\eta_3\eta_{12}}{\eta^2\eta_4^2\eta_6^2}$ of level 12 is a factor of the holomorphic eta quotient $\dfrac{\eta_2^8}{\eta^2\eta_4^2}$ of level 4. So by Lemma 3, the later is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(4)$:

$$\frac{\eta_2^8}{\eta^2\eta_4^2} = \frac{\eta_2^5\eta_3\eta_{12}}{\eta^2\eta_4^2\eta_6^2} \times \frac{\eta_2^3\eta_6^2}{\eta_3\eta_{12}} = \mathrm{p}_{12,4}\Big(\frac{\eta_2^5\eta_3\eta_{12}}{\eta^2\eta_4^2\eta_6^2}\Big) \times \mathrm{p}_{12,4}\Big(\frac{\eta_2^3\eta_6^2}{\eta_3\eta_{12}}\Big) = \frac{\eta_2^3}{\eta\eta_4} \times \frac{\eta_2^5}{\eta\eta_4}.$$

It is easy to check that all the eta quotients above are holomorphic. In particular, from Lemma 3 we conclude:

Corollary 6. *The assertion in part (a) of Theorem 3 holds.*

Corollary 7. *Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $N\|M$. If a holomorphic eta quotient f of level N is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(M)$, then f is also factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N)$.*

Corollary 8. *If a holomorphic eta quotient f of level N has a nontrivial factor of a squarefree level, then f is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N)$.*

6. Construction of new factors

In the previous section, we already saw a partial result (see Corollary 6) towards Theorem 3. In this section, we complete the proof of this theorem by providing a suitable factor of a holomorphic eta quotient f of level N, which satisfies the assumptions in part (b) of Theorem 3. To describe this factor explicitly, first we require to implement a certain normalization of the columns of the inverse of the order matrix A_N of level N (see [5]): Since all the entries of A_N^{-1} are rational with their denominators dividing $\widehat{\varphi}(N)$ (see (3.18), (3.20) and (2.2)), for each $t \in \mathcal{D}_N$, there exists a smallest positive integer $m_{t,N} \,|\, \widehat{\varphi}(N)$ such that $m_{t,N} \cdot A_N^{-1}(_\,, t)$ has integer entries, where $A_N^{-1}(_\,, t)$ denotes the column of A_N indexed by $t \in \mathcal{D}_N$.

Lemma 4. *For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathcal{D}_N$, let $m_{t,N}$ denote the least positive integer such that $m_{t,N} \cdot A_N^{-1}(_\,, t) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$. Then we have*

$$m_{t,N} = \widehat{\varphi}\Big(\frac{N}{t''}\Big)\,\widehat{\varphi}\Big(\frac{t''\operatorname{rad}(t')}{\gcd(t', t''/t')}\Big), \tag{6.1}$$

where t' is the quotient of t by the greatest common exact divisor of N and t, t'' is the least exact divisor of N such that $t' | t''$ and the function $\widehat{\varphi} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is as defined in (2.2).

Proof. If N is a prime power, the claim follows from (3.20). The general case then follows by multiplicativity (see (3.18)). □

We define $B_N \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N \times \mathcal{D}_N}$ by

$$B_N(_\,, t) := m_{t,N} \cdot A_N^{-1}(_\,, t) \text{ for all } t \in \mathcal{D}_N. \tag{6.2}$$

Clearly, B_N is invertible over $\mathbb{Q}$. Since $m_{t,N}$ is multiplicative in N and t, from the multiplicativity of $A_N^{-1}(d, t)$ in N, d and t (see (3.18)), it follows that $B_N(d, t)$ is also multiplicative in N, d and t. That implies:

$$B_N = \bigotimes_{\substack{p \in \wp_N \\ p^n \| N}} B_{p^n}, \tag{6.3}$$

where $\wp_N$ denotes the set of prime divisors of N. For a prime p, from (6.2) and (3.19), we have

$$B_{p^n} = \begin{pmatrix} p & -p & & & & \\ -1 & p^2+1 & -p & & & \\ & -p & p^2+1 & -p & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & -p & p^2+1 & -1 \\ & & & & -p & p \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6.4}$$

From (6.3) and (6.4), it follows that for all $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$, the weight of an eta quotient of the form $\eta^{B_N(_\,, d)}$ is at least $\varphi(\operatorname{rad}(N))/2$ (see (4.8) in [5]). So, the assertion in part (b) of Theorem 3 is implied by the following:

Theorem 3.$(b)'$**.** *Let $N > 1$ be an integer and let f be a holomorphic eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$. Let $M > N$ be a multiple of N with $\mathrm{rad}(M) = \mathrm{rad}(N)$ and let g be a factor of f on $\Gamma_0(M)$ such that the exponent of η_{tM/N_0} in g is nonzero for some $t|N_0$, where N_0 is the greatest common exact divisor of M and N. Let $M_0 := M/N$. If*

$$M_0 \geq 2^{\omega(M_0)-1}\mathrm{rad}(M_0)\widehat{\varphi}(N_0), \tag{6.5}$$

then there exists $r \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$ such that $\eta^{B_N(_\,,rN_1)}$ is a factor of f, where $N_1 := N/N_0$. Moreover, if strict inequality holds in (6.5), then $\eta^{B_N(_\,,rN_1)}$ is a nontrivial factor of f. Here $\omega(M_0)$ denotes the number of distinct prime divisors of M_0 and the function $\widehat{\varphi} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is as defined in (2.2).

To prove the above theorem, we need some intermediate results. To state these results, first we define *composition of eta quotients of coprime levels*: Let $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\gcd(M, N) = 1$. Let $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$, $Y \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$ and let $f = \eta^X$ and $g = \eta^Y$. We define the eta quotient $f \circledast g$ on $\Gamma_0(MN)$ by

$$f \circledast g := \eta^{X\otimes Y} = \prod_{d\in\mathcal{D}_M}\prod_{d'\in\mathcal{D}_N}\eta_{dd'}^{X_dY_{d'}}. \tag{6.6}$$

The following lemma relates the orders of $f \circledast g$ with the orders of f and g at the cusps:

Lemma 5. *Let $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$ be mutually coprime. Let f (resp. g) be an eta quotient of $\Gamma_0(M)$ (resp. $\Gamma_0(N)$). Then for $t \in \mathcal{D}_M$ and $t' \in \mathcal{D}_N$, we have*

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\frac{1}{tt'}}(f \circledast g; \Gamma_0(MN)) = 24 \cdot \mathrm{ord}_{\frac{1}{t}}(f; \Gamma_0(M)) \cdot \mathrm{ord}_{\frac{1}{t'}}(g; \Gamma_0(N)).$$

Proof. Let $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$ (resp. $Y \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_N}$) be such that $f = \eta^X$ (resp. $g = \eta^Y$). Since $\gcd(M, N) = 1$, it follows from (3.18) that

$$A_{MN}(X \otimes Y) = (A_M X) \otimes (A_N Y). \tag{6.7}$$

Now, the claim follows via (3.17). □

Next we provide an essential ingredient of the proof of Theorem 3.$(b)'$:

Lemma 6 (New Factor Lemma)**.** *Let $N > 1$ be an integer and let f be a holomorphic eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$. Let $M > N$ be a multiple of N with $\mathrm{rad}(M) = \mathrm{rad}(N)$ and let g be a factor of f on $\Gamma_0(M)$ such that there exist (not necessarily holomorphic) eta quotients $g' \neq 1$ (resp. g'') on $\Gamma_0(N_0)$ (resp. on $\Gamma_0(M/\mathrm{rad}(M_0))$) with*

$$g = g'_{M_1} \times g'',$$

where N_0 is the greatest common exact divisor of M and N, $M_0 := M/N$, $M_1 := M/N_0$ and g'_{M_1} denotes the rescaling of g' by M_1. Suppose, there exists a nonconstant holomorphic eta quotient h on $\Gamma_0(N_0)$ such that for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$, we have

$$2^{\omega(M_0)-1}\mathrm{rad}(M_0) \cdot \mathrm{ord}_{1/t}(h; \Gamma_0(N_0)) \leq M_0 \cdot \left|\mathrm{ord}_{1/t}(g'; \Gamma_0(N_0))\right|, \tag{6.8}$$

where $\omega(M_0)$ denotes the number of distinct prime divisors of M_0. Let $N_1 := N/N_0$.

(1) *Then $h \circledast \eta^{B_{N_1}(_\,,N_1)}$ is a factor of f on $\Gamma_0(N)$.*

(2) *The above one is a nontrivial factor of f if for at least one $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$, strict inequality holds in* (6.8).

Proof. (1) Let $M_0 = \prod_{p \in \wp_{M_0}} p^{m_p}$, where by $\wp_{M_0}$ we denote the set of prime divisors of M_0. We shall proceed by induction on m_p for all $p \in \wp_{M_0}$. So, first we consider the case where $m_p = 1$ for all such p:

Let $a \in \frac{1}{24}\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$ with $a_r = \mathrm{ord}_{1/r}(g;\Gamma_0(M))$ for $r \in \mathcal{D}_M$. Since $M = N_0M_1$ with N_0 and M_1 mutually coprime, there is a canonical bijection between $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$ and $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_{N_0}} \times \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_{M_1}}$. Let $\widetilde{a} \in \frac{1}{24}(\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_{N_0}} \times \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_{M_1}})$ denote the image of $a \in \frac{1}{24}\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$ under this bijection. Since g is a factor of f, we have

$$0 \le a_r \le \mathrm{ord}_{1/r}(f;\Gamma_0(M)) \text{ for all } r \in \mathcal{D}_M. \tag{6.9}$$

Let $X \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$ (resp. $X' \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_{N_0}}$) be such that $g = \eta^X$ (resp. $g' = \eta^{X'}$). Then from (3.17), we get:

$$X = 24 \cdot A_M^{-1}\, a = 24 \cdot A_{N_0}^{-1} \otimes \Big(\bigotimes_{\substack{p \in \wp_{M_0} \\ p^n \| N}} A_{p^{n+1}}^{-1} \Big)\, a\,, \tag{6.10}$$

where the second equality follows from (3.18). That implies (see Lemma 4.3.1 in [21]):

$$\widetilde{X} = 24 \cdot A_{N_0}^{-1}\, \widetilde{a} \Big(\bigotimes_{\substack{p \in \wp_{M_0} \\ p^n \| N}} A_{p^{n+1}}^{-1} \Big)^{\mathrm{T}}, \tag{6.11}$$

where $\widetilde{X}$ is the image of X under the canonical bijection from $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$ to $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_{N_0}} \times \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_{M_1}}$. Since for all $d \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$, we have

$$X'_d = X_{dM_1} = X_{d \prod_{\substack{p \in \wp_{M_0} \\ p^n \| N}} p^{n+1}},$$

from (6.11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} X' &= 24 \cdot A_{N_0}^{-1}\, \widetilde{a} \Big(\bigotimes_{\substack{p \in \wp_{M_0} \\ p^n \| N}} A_{p^{n+1}}^{-1}(p^{n+1}, _\,) \Big)^{\mathrm{T}} \\ &= \frac{24}{\widehat{\varphi}(N_1)} \cdot A_{N_0}^{-1}(a' - a''), \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

where $A_{p^{n+1}}^{-1}(p^{n+1}, _\,)$ denotes the last row of $A_{p^{n+1}}^{-1}$ and where $a', a'' \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$ are defined by

$$a'_t := \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq \wp_{M_0} \\ \#S \text{ even}}} a_{tN_1 \prod_{p \in \wp_{M_0} \setminus S} p} \quad \text{and} \quad a''_t := \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq \wp_{M_0} \\ \#S \text{ odd}}} a_{tN_1 \prod_{p \in \wp_{M_0} \setminus S} p} \tag{6.13}$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$. Here by $\#S$, we denote the number of elements in S. Above, (6.12) holds since $\widehat{\varphi}$ is multiplicative and since for any prime p, we have

$$A_{p^{n+1}}^{-1}(p^{n+1}, p^n) = -\frac{1}{\widehat{\varphi}(p^n)}, \quad A_{p^{n+1}}^{-1}(p^{n+1}, p^{n+1}) = \frac{1}{\widehat{\varphi}(p^n)}$$

whereas all other entries of $A_{p^{n+1}}^{-1}(p^{n+1}, _\,)$ are zero (see (3.19)).

Now, from (6.12) and (3.17), we get:

$$a'_t - a''_t = \widehat{\varphi}(N_1) \cdot \operatorname{ord}_{1/t}(g'; \Gamma_0(N_0)) \tag{6.14}$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$. As both a'_t and a''_t are nonnegative (see (6.9)), it follows that

$$\max\{a'_t, a''_t\} \geq \widehat{\varphi}(N_1) \cdot |\operatorname{ord}_{1/t}(g'; \Gamma_0(N_0))| \tag{6.15}$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$. Let h be a nonconstant holomorphic eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N_0)$ which satisfies (6.8) for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$. Since both the number of the subsets of $\wp_{M_0}$ of odd cardinality and the number of the subsets of $\wp_{M_0}$ of even cardinality are equal to $2^{\omega(M_0)-1}$ and since $\operatorname{rad}(M_0) = M_0$ in the case under consideration, from (6.8), (6.15) and (6.13), it follows that for each $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$, there exists a subset $S_t \subseteq \wp_{M_0}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\varphi}(N_1) \cdot \operatorname{ord}_{1/t}(h; \Gamma_0(N_0)) &\leq a_{tN_1 \prod\limits_{p \in S_t} p} \\ &\leq \operatorname{ord}_{1/(tN \prod\limits_{p \in S_t} p)}(f; \Gamma_0(M)), \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

where the second inequality follows from (6.9). Again, it follows from (3.4) and (3.9) that for an arbitrary subset $S \subseteq \wp_{M_0}$, we have

$$\operatorname{ord}_{1/(tN_1 \prod\limits_{p \in S} p)}(f; \Gamma_0(N)) = \operatorname{ord}_{1/(tN_1)}(f; \Gamma_0(N)) \tag{6.17}$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$. For $\alpha, \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\gcd(\alpha, \lambda) = 1$ and $s = [\alpha : \lambda] \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$, the width of the cusp s of $\Gamma_0(N)$ is $N/\gcd(\lambda^2, N)$ (see [17], [27]). Hence, it follows from (3.5) and (6.17) that for each subset $S \subseteq \wp_{M_0}$, we have

$$\operatorname{ord}_{1/(tN_1 \prod\limits_{p \in S} p)}(f; \Gamma_0(M)) = \operatorname{ord}_{1/(tN_1)}(f; \Gamma_0(M)) \tag{6.18}$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$. Now, (6.16) and (6.18) together imply that

$$\widehat{\varphi}(N_1) \cdot \operatorname{ord}_{1/t}(h; \Gamma_0(N_0)) \leq \operatorname{ord}_{1/(tN_1 \prod\limits_{p \in S} p)}(f; \Gamma_0(M)) \tag{6.19}$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$ and for all subsets $S \subseteq \wp_{M_0}$.

From (3.7), we obtain that for a prime p and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the orders of $\eta^p_{p^n}/\eta_{p^{n-1}}$ at the cusps $\{1/p^\alpha\}_{0 \leq \alpha \leq n+1}$ of $\Gamma_0(p^{n+1})$ are as follows:

$$\operatorname{ord}_{\frac{1}{p^\alpha}}\left(\frac{\eta^p_{p^n}}{\eta_{p^{n-1}}}; \Gamma_0(p^{n+1})\right) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq \alpha < n, \\ \frac{\widehat{\varphi}(p^n)}{24} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{6.20}$$

From (6.3) and (6.4), it follows that

$$\eta^{B_{N_1}(_, N_1)} = \mathop{\circledast}_{\substack{p \in \wp_{M_0} \\ p^n \| N}} \frac{\eta^p_{p^n}}{\eta_{p^{n-1}}} \tag{6.21}$$

Let $h' := h \circledast \eta^{B_{N_1}(_, N_1)}$. Since $\widehat{\varphi}$ is multiplicative, from (6.20), (6.21) and Lemma 5, we conclude that for $r \in \mathcal{D}_M$, we have

$$\operatorname{ord}_{1/r}(h'; \Gamma_0(M)) = \begin{cases} \widehat{\varphi}(N_1) \cdot \operatorname{ord}_{1/t}(h; \Gamma_0(N_0)) & \text{if } N_1 | r \\ \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{6.22}$$

where $t = \gcd(r, N_0)$. It follows from (6.19) and (6.22) that at each cusp s of $\Gamma_0(M)$, we have

$$\operatorname{ord}_s(h'; \Gamma_0(M)) \leq \operatorname{ord}_s(f; \Gamma_0(M)).$$

Hence, h' is indeed a factor of f.

Thus, we see that for $M_0 = \prod_{p \in \wp_{M_0}} p^{m_p}$, the claim holds if $m_p = 1$ for all $p \in \wp_{M_0}$. Now, for all such p, let us assume that the claim holds for $m_p = n_p$ for some $n_p \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, to complete the induction, it is enough to show that the claim also holds for $m_{p_0} = n_{p_0} + 1$ for an arbitrary prime $p_0 \in \wp_{M_0}$:

Let $N' := Np_0$ and let $M = Np_0^{n_{p_0}+1} \prod_{p \in \wp_{M_0} \setminus \{p_0\}} p^{n_p} = N' \prod_{p \in \wp_{M_0}} p^{n_p}$. Let f be a holomorphic eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$ and let g be a factor of f on $\Gamma_0(M)$ such that there exist (not necessarily holomorphic) eta quotients $g' \neq 1$ (resp. g'') on $\Gamma_0(N_0)$ (resp. on $\Gamma_0(M/\mathrm{rad}(M_0))$) with

$$g = g'_{M_1} \times g'',$$

where N_0 is the greatest common exact divisor of M and N, $M_1 := M/N_0$ and g'_{M_1} denotes the rescaling of g' by M_1. Suppose, there exists a non-constant holomorphic eta quotient h on $\Gamma_0(N_0)$ such that for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$, Inequality (6.8) is satisfied, where $\omega(M_0)$ denotes the number of distinct prime divisors of $M_0 := M/N$. Let $M_0' := M_0/p_0$. Inequality (6.8) is equivalent to the following:

$$2^{\omega(M_0)-1}\mathrm{rad}(M_0) \cdot \operatorname{ord}_{1/t}(h; \Gamma_0(N_0)) \leq M_0' \cdot \left| \operatorname{ord}_{1/t}(g'^{p_0}; \Gamma_0(N_0)) \right|, \tag{6.23}$$

Let $N_1' := N'/N_0$. Then by induction hypothesis, we have

$$\widetilde{h} := h \circledast \eta^{B_{N_1'}(_\,, N_1')} \tag{6.24}$$

is a factor of f^{p_0} on $\Gamma_0(N')$. Let N_0' be the largest divisor of N which is not divisible by p_0. Let $\widetilde{h}'$ (resp. $\widetilde{h}''$) be the eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N_0')$ (resp. $\Gamma_0(N)$) such that

$$\widetilde{h} = \widetilde{h}'_{M_1'} \times \widetilde{h}'', \tag{6.25}$$

where $\widetilde{h}'_{M_1'}$ denotes the rescaling of $\widetilde{h}'$ by $M_1' := p_0^{n_{p_0}+1}$. From (6.3) and (6.4), it follows that

$$\eta^{B_{N_1'}(_\,, N_1')} = \eta^{B_{N_0'}(_\,, N_0')} \circledast \frac{\eta_{p_0^{n_{p_0}+1}}^{p_0}}{\eta_{p_0^{n_{p_0}}}}. \tag{6.26}$$

Since $\circledast$ is associative, from (6.24), (6.25) and (6.26), we obtain:

$$\widetilde{h}' = h \circledast \eta^{B_{N_0'}(_\,, N_0')} \circledast \eta^{p_0} = \left(h \circledast \eta^{B_{N_0'}(_\,, N_0')}\right)^{p_0} \tag{6.27}$$

and

$$\widetilde{h}'' = h \circledast \eta^{B_{N_0'}(_\,, N_0')} \circledast \frac{1}{\eta_{p_0^{n_{p_0}}}}.$$

Let $N_1 := N/N_0$. Since $\widetilde{h}'$ is holomorphic, it follows again by induction hypothesis that

$$\widetilde{h}' \circledast \frac{\eta_{p_0}^{p_0 n_{p_0}}}{\eta_{p_0}^{n_{p_0}-1}} = \left(h \circledast \eta^{B_{N_0'}(_\,,N_0')}\right)^{p_0} \circledast \frac{\eta_{p_0}^{p_0 n_{p_0}}}{\eta_{p_0}^{n_{p_0}-1}}$$

$$= \left(h \circledast \eta^{B_{N_1}(_\,,N_1)}\right)^{p_0} \tag{6.28}$$

is a factor of f^{p_0} on $\Gamma_0(N)$, where the last equality follows again from (6.3) and (6.4). Therefore, $h \circledast \eta^{B_{N_1}(_\,,N_1)}$ is a factor of f on $\Gamma_0(N)$. □

(2) Follows easily from the proof of (1). □

Corollary 9. *Let $N > 1$ be an integer and let f be a holomorphic eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$. Let $M > N$ be a multiple of N with $\mathrm{rad}(M) = \mathrm{rad}(N)$ and let g be a factor of f on $\Gamma_0(M)$ such that there exist (not necessarily holomorphic) eta quotients $g' \neq 1$ (resp. g'') on $\Gamma_0(N_0)$ (resp. on $\Gamma_0(M/\mathrm{rad}(M_0))$) with*

$$g = g'_{M_1} \times g'',$$

where N_0 is the greatest common exact divisor of M and N, $M_0 := M/N$, $M_1 := M/N_0$ and g'_{M_1} denotes the rescaling of g' by M_1. Suppose, there exists a nonconstant holomorphic eta quotient h on $\Gamma_0(N_0)$ such that for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$, we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_{1/t}(h;\Gamma_0(N_0)) \leq \left|\mathrm{ord}_{1/t}(g';\Gamma_0(N_0))\right|.$$

Let $N_1 := N/N_0$. Then the order of the holomorphic eta quotient with rational exponents

$$\left(h \circledast \eta^{B_{N_1}(_\,,N_1)}\right)^{\frac{M_0}{2^{\omega(M_0)-1}\mathrm{rad}(M_0)}}$$

at each the cusp of $\Gamma_0(N)$ is less than or equal to the order of f at that cusp. Here $\omega(M_0)$ denotes the number of distinct prime divisors of M_0. □

Corollary 10. *Let all the assumptions of Corollary 9 hold for a pair of integers N, M with $M > N > 1$, $\mathrm{rad}(M) = \mathrm{rad}(N)$ and a holomorphic eta quotient f on $\Gamma_0(N)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that the weight of f is $k/2$. If the greatest common exact divisor of M and N is 1, then we have*

$$\frac{\varphi(M_0)}{2^{\omega(M_0)-1}} \leq k,$$

where φ denotes Euler's totient function and $\omega(M_0)$ denotes the number of distinct prime divisors of $M_0 := M/N$.

Proof. Let g be a factor of f on $\Gamma_0(M)$ such that there exist (not necessarily holomorphic) eta quotients $g' \neq 1$ (resp. g'') on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ (resp. on $\Gamma_0(M/\mathrm{rad}(M_0))$) with

$$g = g'_M \times g'',$$

where g'_M denotes the rescaling of g' by M. The existence of such a factor g of f follows from the assumptions of Corollary 9 and from the fact that the greatest common exact divisor of M and N is 1. Since an eta quotient on

$\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ is only an integer power of η, there exists a nonzero integer m such that $g' = \eta^m$. Since $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ has only one cusp and since

$$\left|\operatorname{ord}_\infty(g';\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}))\right| = \frac{|m|}{24} \geq \operatorname{ord}_\infty(\eta;\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})),$$

from Corollary 9, it follows that the order of the holomorphic eta quotient with rational exponents

$$f_1 := \left(\eta^{B_N(_\,,N)}\right)^{\frac{M_0}{2^{\omega(M_0)-1}\mathrm{rad}(M_0)}}$$

at each the cusp of $\Gamma_0(N)$ is less than or equal to the order of f at that cusp. Hence, from the valence formula (3.10), it follows that the weight of f_1 is less than the weight of f. Again, (6.3) and (6.4) together imply that that the weight of $\eta^{B_N(_\,,N)}$ is $\varphi(\mathrm{rad}(N))/2$ (see also (4.8) in [5]). So, we obtain:

$$\frac{M_0\varphi(\mathrm{rad}(N))}{2^{\omega(M_0)-1}\mathrm{rad}(M_0)} \leq k. \tag{6.29}$$

Since the set of prime divisors of M and N are the same and since the greatest common exact divisor of M and N is 1, we have $\mathrm{rad}(N) = \mathrm{rad}(M_0)$. Hence, the claim follows from (6.29). □

Proof of Theorem 3.(b)′ Let $M_1 := M/N_0$. Since the exponent of η_{tM_1} in g is nonzero, there exist (not necessarily holomorphic) eta quotients $g' \neq 1$ (resp. g'') on $\Gamma_0(N_0)$ (resp. on $\Gamma_0(M/\mathrm{rad}(M_0))$) with

$$g = g'_{M_1} \times g''.$$

Since $g' \neq 1$, there exists $r \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$ such that $\operatorname{ord}_{1/r}(g';\Gamma_0(N_0)) \neq 0$. So, (3.7) implies that

$$|\operatorname{ord}_{1/r}(g';\Gamma_0(N_0))| \geq \frac{1}{24}. \tag{6.30}$$

Again, from (6.2) and (3.17), it follows that for $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$, we have

$$\operatorname{ord}_{1/t}(\eta^{B_{N_0}(_\,,r)};\Gamma_0(N_0)) = \begin{cases} \frac{m_{r,N_0}}{24} & \text{if } t = r \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{6.31}$$

where m_{r,N_0} is the same as in (6.1) after we replace t with r and N with N_0. Recall from the discussion preceding Lemma 4 that $m_{r,N_0} \,|\, \widehat{\varphi}(N_0)$. So, from (6.30), (6.30) and (6.5), we conclude that

$$2^{\omega(M_0)-1}\mathrm{rad}(M_0) \cdot \operatorname{ord}_{1/t}(\eta^{B_{N_0}(_\,,r)};\Gamma_0(N_0)) \leq M_0 \cdot \left|\operatorname{ord}_{1/t}(g';\Gamma_0(N_0))\right|$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{D}_{N_0}$. Since (6.3) implies that

$$\eta^{B_{N_0}(_\,,r)} \circledast \eta^{B_{N_1}(_\,,N_1)} = \eta^{B_N(_\,,rN_1)},$$

the claim follows from Lemma 6. □

7. Proof of Theorem 2

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a let p be a prime. Let f be a quasi-irreducible holomorphic eta quotient of level p^n. Suppose, f is reducible. Then from Theorem 3.(a), it follows that there exists an integer $m > n$ such that f has a factor of level p^m. Now, Theorem 3.$(b)'$ implies that $g := \eta^p_{p^n}/\eta_{p^{n-1}}$ is a factor of f and the same theorem also implies that if $m > n+1$, then g is a nontrivial factor of f. So, Theorem 2 would follow if we can prove that also in the case $m = n+1$, we have $g \neq f$. We shall do so by showing that unlike f, g is not factorizable on $\Gamma_0(p^{n+1})$:

Lemma 7. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a prime p, the holomorphic eta quotient $\eta^p_{p^n}/\eta_{p^{n-1}}$ is not factorizable on $\Gamma_0(p^{n+1})$.*

Proof. Suppose, there exist nonconstant holomorphic eta quotients f and g on $\Gamma_0(p^{n+1})$ such that

$$fg = \eta^p_{p^n}/\eta_{p^{n-1}}.$$

Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_{p^{n+1}}}$ be such that $f = \eta^X$ and $g = \eta^Y$. From Lemma 3 in [5], we recall that $\eta^p_{p^n}/\eta_{p^{n-1}}$ is not factorizable on $\Gamma_0(p^n)$. Hence, both f and g must be of level p^{n+1}. In other words, neither $X_{p^{n+1}}$ nor $Y_{p^{n+1}}$ is zero. From (6.12), after replacing N_0 with 1 and N_1 with p^n, we obtain:

$$X_{p^{n+1}} = \frac{24(a'-a'')}{\widehat{\varphi}(p^n)} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{p^{n+1}} = \frac{24(b'-b'')}{\widehat{\varphi}(p^n)}, \tag{7.1}$$

where $a' := \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^{n+1}}(f\,;\Gamma_0(p^{n+1}))$, $a'' := \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^n}(f\,;\Gamma_0(p^{n+1}))$, $b' := \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^{n+1}}(g\,;\Gamma_0(p^{n+1}))$ and $b'' := \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^n}(g\,;\Gamma_0(p^{n+1}))$. Since f and g are holomorphic, we have

$$a', a'', b', b'' \geq 0. \tag{7.2}$$

Though both $X_{p^{n+1}}$ and $Y_{p^{n+1}}$ are nonzero, but from the fact that fg is of level p^n, it follows that

$$X_{p^{n+1}} + Y_{p^{n+1}} = 0. \tag{7.3}$$

So, without loss of generality, we may assume that $X_{p^{n+1}} > 0$. Then (7.1), (7.2) and (7.3) together imply that

$$a' + b' = a'' + b'' \;\geq\; b'' = b' + \frac{\widehat{\varphi}(p^n)}{24} X_{p^{n+1}} \;\geq\; \frac{\widehat{\varphi}(p^n)}{24}. \tag{7.4}$$

Since $fg = \eta^p_{p^n}/\eta_{p^{n-1}}$, the sum of the orders of f and g at the cusps $\{1/p^j\}_{0\leq j\leq n+1}$ of $\Gamma_0(p^{n+1})$ are then given by (6.20). Since both f and g are holomorphic, they have nonnegative orders at all the cusps. So, from (6.20), it follows that for $0 \leq j < n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^j}(f\,;\Gamma_0(p^{n+1})) &= \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^j}(g\,;\Gamma_0(p^{n+1})) \\ &= \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^j}\left(\frac{\eta^p_{p^n}}{\eta_{p^{n-1}}}\,;\Gamma_0(p^{n+1})\right) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

Also, from (6.20), we obtain:

$$a'' + b'' = \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^n}\left(\frac{\eta^p_{p^n}}{\eta_{p^{n-1}}}\,;\Gamma_0(p^{n+1})\right) = \frac{\widehat{\varphi}(p^n)}{24}$$

and

$$a' + b' = \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^n}\left(\frac{\eta^p_{p^{n+1}}}{\eta_{p^{n-1}}}; \Gamma_0(p^{n+1})\right) = \frac{\widehat{\varphi}(p^n)}{24}.$$

In other words, all the equalities in (7.4) hold. Hence, we have $a'' = b' = 0$ and $a' = b'' = \widehat{\varphi}(p^n)/24$, i. e.

$$\mathrm{ord}_{1/p^n}(f; \Gamma_0(p^{n+1})) = \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^{n+1}}(g; \Gamma_0(p^{n+1})) = 0 \tag{7.6}$$

and

$$\mathrm{ord}_{1/p^{n+1}}(f; \Gamma_0(p^{n+1})) = \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^n}(g; \Gamma_0(p^{n+1})) = \frac{\widehat{\varphi}(p^n)}{24}. \tag{7.7}$$

Now, from (3.17), (7.5), (7.6), (7.7) and (3.20), it follows that

$$X_{p^n} = 24 \cdot A^{-1}_{p^{n+1}}(p^n, p^{n+1}) \cdot \mathrm{ord}_{1/p^{n+1}}(f; \Gamma_0(p^{n+1})) = -1/p \notin \mathbb{Z}.$$

Thus, we get a contradiction! □

8. An implication of the Reducibility Conjecture

In this section, we shall see how the Irreducibility Conjecture follows from the Reducibility Conjecture. Also, we shall see that the truth of the Reducibility Conjecture for prime power levels (Theorem 2) implies the truth of the Irreducibility Conjecture for the same (Corollary 1).

First, we would require a few results on Atkin-Lehner involutions :

Lemma 8. (*a*) *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let n be an exact divisor of N. Let f, g and h be eta quotients on $\Gamma_0(N)$ such that $f = gh$. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{al}_{n,N}(f) = \mathrm{al}_{n,N}(g) \cdot \mathrm{al}_{n,N}(h),$$

where the map $\mathrm{al}_{n,N}$ is as defined in (3.3).
(*b*) *Let f be an eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$ and let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ be a multiple of N. Let m be an exact divisor of M. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{al}_{m,M}(f) = (\mathrm{al}_{n,N}(f))_\nu,$$

where $n = (m, N)$, $\nu = m/n$ and $(\mathrm{al}_{n,N}(f))_\nu$ denotes the rescaling of the eta quotient $\mathrm{al}_{n,N}(f)$ by ν.
(*c*) *Let f be an eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$ and let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ be a multiple of N. Let m (resp. n) be an exact divisor of M (resp. N) such that $n|m$. Let $\nu := m/n$. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{al}_{m,M}(f_\nu) = \mathrm{al}_{n,N}(f).$$

Proof. (*a*) Follows trivially from (3.3) whereas (*b*) from the fact that $\nu n \odot d = \nu(n \odot d)$ for all $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and (*c*) from the fact that $(\nu n) \odot (\nu d) = n \odot d$ for all $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$. □

Corollary 11. *Let f be a holomorphic eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$ and let $n \| N$. Then f is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N)$ if and only if so is $\mathrm{al}_{n,N}(f)$.* □

Corollary 12. *Let f be an eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$ and let f_ν be the rescaling of f by $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{al}_{\nu N, \nu N}(f_\nu) = \mathrm{al}_{N,N}(f).$$

□

Corollary 13. *Let f be an irreducible holomorphic eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(N)$ and let n be an exact divisor of N. Then $\mathrm{al}_{n,N}(f)$ is not factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N)$.* □

From Corollary 13, it immediately follows that Conjecture 2′ is a consequence of the Reducibility Conjecture:

Corollary 14. *Conjecture 1 implies Conjecture 2′.* □

Next, we show that the two forms of the Irreducibility Conjecture are equivalent:

Corollary 15. *Conjecture 2 and Conjecture 2′ are equivalent.*

Proof. It follows from Corollary 12 that Conjecture 2′ implies Conjecture 2, whereas the reverse implication follows from Lemma 8.(c) and Corollary 11. □

In order to show that Theorem 2 implies Corollary 1, we require a few more results on Atkin-Lehner involutions and the level lowering map which we defined in Section 5. For $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $N \| M$, the following lemma lets us interchange the order of the operation of $\mathrm{p}_{M,N}$ (see (5.2)) with that of the Atkin-Lehner involutions on the set of eta quotients on $\Gamma_0(M)$:

Lemma 9. (a) *Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and let m, N be exact divisors of M. Let $n := \gcd(m, N)$. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{p}_{M,N} \circ \mathrm{al}_{m,M} = \mathrm{al}_{n,N} \circ \mathrm{p}_{M,N}.$$

(b) *Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $M' \in \mathcal{D}_M$. Let N be an exact divisor of M and let $N' := \gcd(N, M')$. Let f be an eta quotient on $\Gamma_0(M')$. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{p}_{M,N}(f) = \mathrm{p}_{M',N'}(f).$$

Proof. (a) Follows easily from fact that for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$, each exact divisor m of M induces an involution on $\mathcal{D}_M$ defined by $d \mapsto m \odot d$ for $d \in \mathcal{D}_M$, where $\odot$ is as defined in (3.1).
(b) Follows trivially from (5.1) and (5.2). □

Proposition 1. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if the Reducibility Conjecture holds for the holomorphic eta quotients whose levels have at most n distinct prime divisors, then the image of an irreducible holomorphic eta quotient of such a level under an Atkin-Lehner involution is irreducible.*

Proof. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ have at most n distinct prime divisors and let f be an irreducible holomorphic eta quotient of level N. Suppose, there exists a multiple M of N and an exact divisor m of M such that $\mathrm{al}_{m,M}(f)$ is reducible. Than there exists a multiple M' of M such that $\mathrm{al}_{m,M}(f)$ is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(M')$. Let N' be the exact divisor of M' with $\mathrm{rad}(N') = \mathrm{rad}(N)$. Let $N_1 := \gcd(N', M)$. Then N divides N_1. Let $n_1 := \gcd(m, N_1)$. Then we have

(8.1)
$$\mathrm{p}_{M',N'} \circ \mathrm{al}_{m,M}(f) = \mathrm{p}_{M,N_1} \circ \mathrm{al}_{m,M}(f) = \mathrm{al}_{n_1,N_1} \circ \mathrm{p}_{M,N_1}(f) = \mathrm{al}_{n_1,N_1}(f),$$

where the first equality follows from Lemma 9.(b), the second from Lemma 9.(a) and the third from Lemma 2.(a). Since $\mathrm{al}_{m,M}(f)$ is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(M')$,

from (8.1) and from Lemma 2.(b), it follows that $\mathrm{al}_{n_1,N_1}(f)$ is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N')$. Again, since N_1 has at most n distinct prime divisors, according to our assumption, the Reducibility Conjecture holds for eta quotients of level N_1. Therefore, $\mathrm{al}_{n_1,N_1}(f)$ is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(N_1)$. Hence, Corollary 11 implies that f is reducible. Thus, we get a contradiction! □

The last proposition and Corollary 12 together imply:

Corollary 16. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if the Reducibility Conjecture holds for the holomorphic eta quotients whose levels have at most n distinct prime divisors, then the rescaling by any positive integer of an irreducible holomorphic eta quotient of such a level is irreducible.* □

From Proposition 1 and Corollary 16, it follows that Theorem 2 implies Corollary 1.

9. Proof of Theorem 4

Let f be a reducible holomorphic eta quotient of weight $k/2$ and level N and let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ be the least positive multiple of N such that f is factorizable on $\Gamma_0(M)$. Then from Theorem 3.(a), it follows that $\mathrm{rad}(M) = \mathrm{rad}(N)$. Let $g, h \notin \{1, f\}$ be two holomorphic eta quotients on $\Gamma_0(M)$ such that $f = g \times h$. Our strategy for proving Theorem 4 is as follows:

For M sufficiently large, we provide a construction of two nonconstant holomorphic eta quotients $\widetilde{g}$ and $\widetilde{h}$ on $\Gamma_0(\widetilde{M})$ for some positive multiple $\widetilde{M}$ of N with $\widetilde{M} < M$ such that $f = \widetilde{g} \times \widetilde{h}$, using the level lowering map which we provided in Section 5. This would contradict the minimality of M. So, we compute the maximum size of M for which our construction of the holomorphic eta quotients $\widetilde{g}$ and $\widetilde{h}$ as above may fail, thereby establishing the theorem.

For $d \in \mathcal{D}_N$, if the exponent of η_d in f is nonzero, then the exponent of η_d must also be nonzero in either g or h. However, this information is not sufficient to construct an $\widetilde{M}$ as above: Rather, we require to find the smallest multiple M' of N in $\mathcal{D}_M$ such that there exist $d', d'' | M'$ with both the exponent of $\eta_{d'}$ in g and the exponent of $\eta_{d''}$ in h nonzero. Let $X, Y \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$ be such that $g = \eta^X$ and $h = \eta^Y$. Let d' and d'' be the least integers in $\mathcal{D}_M$ such that neither $X_{d'}$ nor $Y_{d''}$ is zero and let $M' := \mathrm{lcm}(d', d'', N)$. Henceforth, we shall assume that $M' > N$ and soon we shall provide an upper bound on M'. In particular, this bound (see (9.1)) is trivial for the case $M' = N$. Consequently, the upper bound for M in that case is actually much less than the upper bound for M in the case $M' > N$ (see (9.14)). Hence, it suffices to settle only the later case.

Clearly, we have $M' > N$ only if either d' or d'' does not divide N. Since at least one of d' and d'' must divide N, without loss of generality, let us assume that $d' \notin \mathcal{D}_N$ and $d'' \in \mathcal{D}_N$. Let $M_0 := M'/N$, let N_0 be the greatest common exact divisor of M' and N, let $M_1 := M'/N_0$ and $N_1 := N/N_0$. Let M_1' be the least exact divisor of M which is divisible by M_1. Let $f' := \mathrm{p}_{M,M_1'}(f)$ and $g' := \mathrm{p}_{M,M_1'}(g)$. Then g' is a factor of f'. Lemma 2.(b) implies that the weight of f' is the same as the weight of f. Since the level of g' is at least $M_1 > N_1$ which is greater than or equal to

the level of f' and since the greatest common exact divisor of M_1 and N_1 is 1, it follows from Corollary 10 that

$$\frac{\varphi(M_0)}{2^{\omega(M_0)-1}} \leq k$$

which implies:

$$M' = NM_0 \leq 2Nk. \tag{9.1}$$

Now, define the sequence $\{d_0, d_1, d_2, \ldots\}$ in $\mathcal{D}_M$ as follows: $d_0 := M'$ and for $j \geq 1$, let $d_j \in \mathcal{D}_M$ be such that

(1) d_j does not divide $L_j := \operatorname{lcm}(d_0, d_1, \ldots, d_{j-1})$.
(2) X_{d_j} is nonzero.
(3) $\frac{d_j}{\gcd(d_j, L_j)} \leq \frac{d}{\gcd(d, L_j)}$ for all $d \in \mathcal{D}_M$ which satisfies (1) and (2) above.

Since $d_j \nmid N$ for all j and since the level of $g \times h = f$ is N, it follows that the exponents of η_{d_j} is zero in f for all j. In other words, we have

$$Y_{d_j} = -X_{d_j} \tag{9.2}$$

for all j. So, we would have obtained the same sequence $\{d_0, d_1, d_2, \ldots\}$ if for $j \geq 1$, we would have defined $d_j \in \mathcal{D}_M$ instead by replacing X_{d_j} with Y_{d_j} in (2) above.

Since g is a nontrivial factor of f, the weight of g is less than or equal to $(k-1)/2$. So, (3.13) implies that

$$\|X\| \leq R_{k-1}(M) = R_{k-1}(N), \tag{9.3}$$

where the last equality follows from (2.5), since the set of prime divisors of M and N are the same. Recall from (3.13) that $\|X\| = \sum_d |X_d|$.

In particular, (9.3) implies that the number of $d \in \mathcal{D}_M$ with $X_d \neq 0$ is bounded above by $R_{k-1}(N)$. So, the sequence $\{d_0, d_1, d_2, \ldots\}$ terminates at some $d_n \in \mathcal{D}_M$ such that

$$n \leq R_{k-1}(N) - 1. \tag{9.4}$$

It follows that each $d \in \mathcal{D}_M$ with nonzero X_d (or equivalently, nonzero Y_d) must divide L_{n+1}. In other words, we have

$$M = L_{n+1}. \tag{9.5}$$

Since d_0 is a multiple of the level of f, from Lemma 2.(a) it follows that

$$f = \mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(g) \times \mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(h) \tag{9.6}$$

for all j. Clearly, for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, there exist nonconstant (but not necessarily holomorphic) eta quotients g'_j, g''_j, h'_j and h''_j on $\Gamma_0(M)$, where the levels of g'_j and h'_j divide L_j and the exponents of η_d are zero in g''_j and h''_j for all $d | L_j$ such that

$$g = g'_j \times g''_j \quad \text{and} \quad h = h'_j \times h''_j. \tag{9.7}$$

From the same reasoning by which we obtained (9.2), it follows that

$$g''_j \times h''_j = 1. \tag{9.8}$$

Since p_{M,L_j} is a homomorphism, we have

$$\mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(g''_j) \times \mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(h''_j) = 1. \tag{9.9}$$

Since the levels of g'_j and h'_j divide L_j, from Lemma 2.(a) it follows that $g'_j := \mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(g'_j)$ and $h'_j := \mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(h'_j)$. Hence, (9.6), (9.7) and (9.9) together imply that

$$f = g'_j \times h'_j. \tag{9.10}$$

Since g (resp. h) is holomorphic, Lemma 2.(d) implies that $\mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(g) = g'_j \times \mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(g''_j)$ (resp. $\mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(h) = h'_j \times \mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(h''_j)$) is holomorphic. Since the exponents in g'_j and h'_j are all integers, it follows from (3.7) that for each cusp s of $\Gamma_0(L_j)$, both $24 \cdot \mathrm{ord}_s(g'_j;\Gamma_0(L_j))$ and $24 \cdot \mathrm{ord}_s(h'_j;\Gamma_0(L_j))$ are integers.

Hence, if at each cusp s of $\Gamma_0(L_j)$, we have

$$\max\{|\,\mathrm{ord}_s(\mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(g''_j);\Gamma_0(L_j))|\,, |\,\mathrm{ord}_s(\mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(h''_j);\Gamma_0(L_j))|\} < \frac{1}{24}, \tag{9.11}$$

then g'_j (resp. h'_j) must be holomorphic. But the fact that g'_j and h'_j are nonconstant holomorphic eta quotients on $\Gamma_0(L_j)$ with $L_j < M$ such that their product is f (see (9.10)) contradicts the minimality of M.

Let $X', X'' \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathcal{D}_M}$ be such that $g'_j = \eta^{X'}$ and $g''_j = \eta^{X''}$. Then from Conditions (1) and (2) in the definition of the finite sequence $\{d_0, d_1, \ldots, d_n\}$, it follows that $\|X'\| \geq j$. Since $X = X' + X''$, (9.3) implies that

$$\|X''\| \leq R_{k-1}(N) - j. \tag{9.12}$$

From (5.1), (5.2) and from Condition (3) in the definition of the finite sequence $\{d_0, d_1, \ldots, d_n\}$, it follows that the absolute value of each exponent in $\mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(g''_j)$ is less than or equal to

$$\|X''\| \frac{\gcd(d_j, L_j)}{d_j}.$$

Hence, (3.17), (3.15), (3.7) and (9.12) together imply that at each cusp s of $\Gamma_0(L_j)$, the absolute value of the order of $\mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(g''_j)$ is less than or equal to

$$\mathcal{M}_j := L_j(R_{k-1}(N) - j)\frac{\gcd(d_j, L_j)}{24 \cdot d_j}.$$

Similarly, we obtain that the absolute value of the order of $\mathrm{p}_{M,L_j}(h''_j)$ is less than or equal to $\mathcal{M}_j$ at each cusp s of $\Gamma_0(L_j)$. So, from (9.11) and from the discussion following it, we conclude that the inequality: $\mathcal{M}_j < 1/24$ leads to a contradiction to the minimality of M with respect to the fact that f factorizes on $\Gamma_0(M)$. Therefore, for all j, we must have $\mathcal{M}_j \geq 1/24$, i. e.

$$\frac{d_j}{\gcd(d_j, L_j)} \leq L_j(R_{k-1}(N) - j).$$

That implies:

$$L_{j+1} = \mathrm{lcm}(d_j, L_j) \leq L_j^2(R_{k-1}(N) - j) \tag{9.13}$$

for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. By induction, from the recurrence inequality above, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} M = L_{n+1} &\leq L_1^{2^n}(R_{k-1}(N) - n)^{2^{n-1}} \cdots (R_{k-1}(N) - 1) \\ &\leq (2Nk)^{2^{R_{k-1}(N)-1}} \Upsilon(R_{k-1}(N)), \end{aligned} \tag{9.14}$$

where the function $\Upsilon : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is as defined in (2.4). Since $L_1 = M'$, The last inequality follows from (9.1) and (9.4). □

Acknowledgments

For the first three months, my work on this paper was solely funded by my parents, Biman Bhattacharyay & Krishna Bhattacharya and my brother, Riju Bhattacharya. Indeed, no thanks are enough for their kind encouragement and loving support. I am also grateful to CIRM : FBK Trento for funding my subsequent research on this project. Besides, during the preparation of this article, I benefited greatly from my short visits to IMSc Chennai, IISc Bangalore, ISI Bangalore, IISER Pune, ICTP Trieste and ISI Kolkata. I am very thankful to Sanoli Gun, Soumya Das, Balasubramanian Sury, Debargha Banerjee, Fernando Rodriguez Villegas and Satadal Ganguly for inviting me to these excellent research institutes.

References

[1] G. E. Andrews and K. Eriksson, *Integer partitions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004, MR 2122332, Zbl 1073.11063, http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139167239.

[2] A. O. L. Atkin and J. Lehner, "Hecke operators on $\Gamma_0(m)$," *Math. Ann.*, vol. 185, pp. 134–160, 1970, MR 0268123, Zbl 0177.34901, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01359701.

[3] A. Berkovich and F. G. Garvan, "K. Saito's conjecture for nonnegative eta products and analogous results for other infinite products," *J. Number Theory*, vol. 128, no. 6, pp. 1731–1748, 2008, MR 2419190, Zbl 1143.05008, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jnt.2007.02.002.

[4] B. C. Berndt, *Ramanujan's Notebooks. Part III.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0965-2.

[5] S. Bhattacharya, "Finiteness of irreducible holomorphic eta quotients of a given level," preprint, http://arxiv.org/pdf/1602.02814.pdf.

[6] ——, "Finiteness of simple holomorphic eta quotients of a given weight," preprint, http://arxiv.org/pdf/1602.02825.pdf.

[7] ——, "Holomorphic eta quotients of weight 1/2," preprint, http://arxiv.org/pdf/1602.02835.pdf.

[8] ——, "Infinite families of simple holomorphic eta quotients," in preparation.

[9] ——, "Factorization of holomorphic eta quotients," Ph.D thesis, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, 2014, hss.ulb.uni-bonn.de/2014/3711/3711.pdf.

[10] J. M. Borwein, A. Straub, J. Wan, and W. Zudilin, "Densities of short uniform random walks." *Can. J. Math.*, vol. 64, no. 5, pp. 961–990, 2012, Zbl 1296.33011, http://dx.doi.org/10.4153/CJM-2011-079-2.

[11] D. Choi, "Spaces of modular forms generated by eta-quotients," *Ramanujan J.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 69–77, 2007, MR 2298641, Zbl 1197.11052, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11139-006-9007-3.

[12] S. Chowla and A. Selberg, "On Epstein's zeta-function," *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, vol. 227, pp. 86–110, 1967, MR 0215797.

[13] H. Cohen, *Number Theory, Volume II: Analytic and Modern Tools*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2007, Graduate Texts in Mathematics. 240, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-49894-2.

[14] S. Cooper, S. Gun, and B. Ramakrishnan, "On the lacunarity of two-eta-products." *Georgian Math. J.*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 659–673, 2006, MR 2309250, Zbl 1163.11033.

[15] A. Dabholkar, S. Murthy, and D. Zagier, "Quantum Black Holes, Wall Crossing, and Mock Modular Forms," to appear in Cambridge Monographs in Mathematical Physics, http://arxiv.org/pdf/1208.4074.pdf.

[16] R. Dedekind, "Schreiben an Herrn Borchardt über die Theorie der elliptischen Modul-Functionen," *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, vol. 83, pp. 265–292, 1877, MR 1579737, http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/crll.1877.83.265.

[17] F. Diamond and J. Shurman, *A First Course in Modular Forms*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005, Graduate Texts in Mathematics. 228, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/b138781.

[18] V. G. Drinfel'd, "Two theorems on modular curves," *Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen.*, vol. 7, no. 2, p. 8384, 1973, MR 0318157.

[19] K. Harada, *"Moonshine" of finite groups*, ser. EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2010, MR 2722318, http://dx.doi.org/10.4171/090.

[20] F. Hirzebruch and D. Zagier, *The Atiyah-Singer Theorem and Elementary Number Theory*. Boston, Mass.: Publish or Perish Inc., 1974, mathematics Lecture Series, No. 3.

[21] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1994, MR 1288752.

[22] T. Ibukiyama, "Modular forms of rational weights and modular varieties," *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg*, vol. 70, pp. 315–339, 2000, MR 1809555, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02940923.

[23] V. G. Kac, "Infinite-dimensional algebras, Dedekind's η-function, classical Möbius function and the very strange formula," *Adv. in Math.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 85–136, 1978, MR 563927, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8708(78)90033-6.

[24] L. J. P. Kilford, "Generating spaces of modular forms with η-quotients," *JP J. Algebra Number Theory Appl.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 213–226, 2007, MR 2406859.

[25] P. Kleban and D. Zagier, "Crossing probabilities and modular forms," *J. Statist. Phys.*, vol. 113, no. 3-4, pp. 431–454, 2003, MR 2013692, http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1026012600583.

[26] G. Köhler, *Eta products and theta series identities*, ser. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011, MR 2766155, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-16152-0.

[27] W. Kohnen and G. Mason, "On generalized modular forms and their applications," *Nagoya Math. J.*, vol. 192, pp. 119–136, 2008, MR 2477614.

[28] R. J. Lemke Oliver, "Eta-quotients and theta functions," *Adv. Math.*, vol. 241, pp. 1–17, 2013, MR 3053701, Zbl 1282.11030, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2013.03.019.

[29] D. Mackenzie, *What's happening in the mathematical sciences*. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2009, vol. 7, Zbl 1326.00011.

[30] J. I. Manin, "Parabolic points and zeta functions of modular curves," *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, vol. 36, p. 1966, 1972, MR 0314846.

[31] Y. Martin, "Multiplicative η-quotients," *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 348, no. 12, pp. 4825–4856, 1996, MR 1376550, http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-96-01743-6.

[32] G. Mersmann, "Holomorphe η-produkte und nichtverschwindende ganze modulformen für $\Gamma_0(N)$," Diplomarbeit, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, 1991, https://sites.google.com/site/soumyabhattacharya/miscellany/Mersmann.pdf.

[33] D. Mumford, "Varieties defined by quadratic equations," in *Questions on Algebraic Varieties* (*C.I.M.E., III Ciclo, Varenna, 1969*). Edizioni Cremonese, Rome, 1970, pp. 29–100, MR 0282975.

[34] M. Newman, "Construction and application of a class of modular functions," *Proc. London. Math. Soc.* (3), vol. 7, pp. 334–350, 1957, MR 0091352.

[35] ——, "Construction and application of a class of modular functions. II," *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3), vol. 9, pp. 373–387, 1959, MR 0107629.

[36] K. Ono, *The web of modularity: arithmetic of the coefficients of modular forms and q-series*, ser. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004, vol. 102, MR 2020489.

[37] H. Rademacher, *Topics in analytic number theory*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1973, MR 0364103.

[38] R. A. Rankin, *Modular forms and functions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1977, MR 0498390.

[39] J. Rouse and J. J. Webb, "On spaces of modular forms spanned by eta-quotients," *Adv. Math.*, vol. 272, pp. 200–224, 2015, MR 3303232, Zbl 1327.11026, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2014.12.002.

[40] N. Rustom, "Generators and relations of the graded algebra of modular forms," *Ramanujan J.*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 315–338, 2016, MR 3448986, Zbl 06544536, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11139-015-9674-z.

[41] A. van der Poorten and K. S. Williams, "Values of the Dedekind eta function at quadratic irrationalities," *Canad. J. Math.*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 176–224, 1999, MR 1692895, Zbl 0936.11026, http://dx.doi.org/10.4153/CJM-1999-011-1.

[42] D. Zagier, "Vassiliev invariants and a strange identity related to the Dedekind eta-function," *Topology*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 945–960, 2001, MR 1860536, Zbl 0989.57009, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0040-9383(00)00005-7.

[43] ——, "Elliptic modular forms and their applications," in *The 1-2-3 of modular forms*, ser. Universitext. Springer, Berlin, 2008, pp. 1–103, MR 2409678, http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74119-0_1.

Indian Statistical Institute, 203 B. T. Road, Kolkata 700108
E-mail address: soumya.bhattacharya@gmail.com